

# AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XX. No. 12 }  
WHOLE No. 506 }

DECEMBER 28, 1918

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS  
\$3.00 A YEAR

## Chronicle

**The War.**—During the week no military movement of any importance was made by the troops of the Allies or of the United States in the enemy territory. But according to a dispatch from Zurich,

*Military Movements*, Dec. 16, p.m.-Dec. 23, a.m. Switzerland, to the *Paris Journal*,

Field Marshal von Hindenburg telegraphed to the Berlin Government advising it that it was his intention to form a new front six miles behind the neutral zone fixed by the armistice. The exact answer of the Berlin Government to this notice is not yet officially known, but according to a Copenhagen dispatch to the *London Daily Mail*, the German Government accepted the Field Marshal's plan to form the People's Guard or National Army. It was stated that the army thus organized would be an effective force and that women would be accepted for auxiliary services.

*Presidential Activities in Europe*  
In the early part of the week President Wilson received at the Hôtel de Ville, Paris, the greetings of the Prefect of the Seine and of the President of the Municipal Council. In the course of the ceremonies the representative of the Council presented to the President the gold medal of the City of Paris and to Mrs. Wilson a diamond brooch. In his address to Mr. Wilson, Mr. Adrien Mithouard, the President of the Municipal Council, said that he was happy to be able to welcome "the chief of the great nation, whose aid, arriving so opportunely, brought us victory, and the upright man whose conscience fashioned his policy and whose diplomacy was made of loyalty." In his reply the President referred among other things to the sufferings of France in the war and to the motives which had influenced the United States to enter it, saying:

We were the more deeply moved by the wrongs of the war because we knew the manner in which they were perpetrated. . . . These sufferings have filled our hearts with indignation. We know what they were, not only, but we know what they signified, and our hearts were touched to the quick by them, our imagination filled with the whole picture of what France and Belgium in particular had experienced.

When the United States entered the war, therefore, they entered it not only because they were moved by a conviction that the purposes of the Central Empires were wrong and must be resisted by men everywhere who loved liberty and the right, but also because the illicit ambitions which they were entertaining and attempting to realize had led to the practices which

shocked our hearts as much as they offended our principles. Our resolution was formed because we knew how profoundly great principles of right were affected, but our hearts moved also with our resolution.

You have been exceedingly generous in what you have been gracious enough to say about me, generous far beyond my personal deserts, but you have interpreted with real insight the motives and resolution of the people of the United States. Whatever influence I exercise, whatever authority I speak with, I derive from them. I know what they have thought. I know what they have desired, and when I have spoken what I know was in their minds it has been delightful to see how the consciences and purposes of freemen everywhere responded. We have merely established our right to the full fellowship of those peoples here and throughout the world who reverence the right of genuine liberty and justice.

According to the press reports of December 18, a Papal letter was presented on that date to Mr. Wilson by Mgr. Ceretti, the Papal Under-Secretary of State. The letter asked assistance on behalf of small oppressed nationalities, especially Armenia and Poland. The Pope also pleaded on behalf of the new countries arising out of the partition of the Dual Monarchy. It was stated that Bohemia was especially mentioned. The Holy Father, the same reports added, asked President Wilson to realize those ambitions regardless of religion or race. On the same day the French Federation of Catholic Employees presented the President with an address expressing their respect for him and their admiration for the American people.

On December 19, King Victor Emmanuel of Italy, accompanied by the heir to the Italian throne, the Prince of Piedmont, arrived in Paris, where he was welcomed by President Poincaré, Premier Clemenceau and other Ministers. Shortly after his arrival the King called upon President Wilson at the Murat mansion. Later on the President conferred with the Italian Premier, Signor Orlando, and the Italian Foreign Minister, Baron Sonnino. He also had conferences with Mr. Venizelos, the Greek statesman, with Count Romanones, the Spanish Premier, and with Marshal Foch. He was present at a solemn function of the French Academy on the occasion of the reception of Marshal Joffre, who won the first battle of the Marne, as one of the Forty Immortals. Among the simple but heartfelt passages of the speech of Marshal Joffre the following was especially noticed in which he

referred to his trip to the United States and paid a glowing tribute to the soldiers and the womanhood of America:

While in the midst of the American crowds I was living hours which I number among the sweetest of my life. I had divined the need for sacrifices on their part awakened in the soul of this generous people by the heroism of our soldiers and the justice of our cause. In order that France might live in prosperity, that Belgium might re-establish herself, that liberty might reign, and that right might be reinstated, America arose and resolved to throw into the fight her last man and her last dollar.

History does not record a more marvelous achievement than that of millions of men voluntarily breaking away from their peaceful pursuits to cross the seas, where lurked death; to come thousands of miles from their country and give up their lives for a noble cause, a great ideal. And as if the sacrifice was not completed by sending the husbands and sons, we have seen the wives, the fathers, and the mothers escorting across the seas that phalanx of warriors to alleviate our sufferings and dress our wounds. We have seen them unsparingly giving their gold and the treasures of their hearts, kneeling on the graves of our sons and adopting our orphans. In a brotherly embrace, France and America have given each other their faith, a pledge for the present and the future.

On December 21, in the amphitheater of the University of Paris, the Sorbonne, in the presence of President Poincaré, the Presidents of the Senate and Chamber of the Senate and Chamber of Deputies, and the diplomatic corps, the President received the degree of Doctor, *honoris causa*, conferred upon him in recognition of his work as a jurist and historian. It was the first time in the history of the University that an honorary degree was bestowed. Alfred Croiset, Dean of the Faculty of letters, and Lucien Poincaré, Vice-Rector of the University and brother of the President of the Republic, made addresses. Among other things in his speech, M. L. Poincaré said:

History will recount how, taking inspiration from the American people and your own thoughts, you reached one glorious day the decision which is one of the greatest events recorded in the war and, in your own words, placed the blood and all the power of America at the service of the principles which have given her life. History will also tell how you have sought to realize the imperishable supremacy of right by means of an association of peoples which should liberate the world.

In his speech of acknowledgment the President dwelt upon the triumph of the "university spirit," the triumph of a higher form of culture over a lower one, explained more clearly, perhaps, although as yet only in general terms his conception of a League of Nations, and stated in conclusion that he felt that in honoring him the University had honored the people whom he represented. The salient portions of his speech are as follows:

I agree with the intimation which has been conveyed today that the terrible war through which we have just passed has not been only a war between nations, but that it has been also a war between systems of culture, the one system the aggressive system, using science without conscience, stripping learning of its moral restraints, and using every faculty of the human mind to do wrong to the whole race; the other system reminiscent of the high traditions of men, reminiscent of all these

struggles, some of them obscure, but others clearly revealed in history, of men of indomitable spirit everywhere struggling toward the right and seeking above all things else to be free. The triumph of freedom in this war means that that spirit shall now dominate the world. There is a great wave of moral force moving through the world, and every man who opposes himself to that wave will go down in disgrace. The task of those who are gathered here, or will presently be gathered here, to make the settlements of this peace, is greatly simplified by the fact that they are the masters of no one; they are the servants of mankind. And if we do not heed the mandates of mankind we shall make ourselves the most conspicuous and deserved failures in the history of the world.

My conception of the League of Nations is just this, that it shall operate as the organized moral force of men throughout the world, and that whenever or wherever wrong and aggression are planned or contemplated, this searching light of conscience will be turned upon them, and men everywhere will ask, "What are the purposes that you hold in your heart against the fortunes of the world?" Just a little exposure will settle most questions. If the Central Powers had dared to discuss the purposes of this war for a single fortnight, it never would have happened; and if, as should be, they were forced to discuss it for a year, the war would have been inconceivable. So I feel that war is, as has been said more than once today, intimately related with the university spirit. The university spirit is intolerant of all the things that put the human mind under restraint. It is tolerant of everything that seeks to retard the advancement of ideals, the acceptance of the truth, the purification of life; and every university man can ally himself with the forces of the present time with the feeling that now at last the spirit of truth, the spirit to which universities have devoted themselves, has prevailed and is triumphant.

On December 22 the President and Mrs. Wilson visited the American Red Cross hospital at Neuilly and the French hospital at Val de Grâce.

Declaring that the attitude of the President in keeping the nation in the dark as to what he intended and hoped to accomplish in the Peace Conference might prove fatal to the establishment of a lasting peace, Senator Lodge and the "Fourteen Principles" of Massachusetts, in an address in the Senate on December 21 stated that five of the President's "fourteen principles" should be left aside until the paramount issues involved in the task of making it impossible for Germany again to wage war were settled. The introduction of some of these fourteen principles at the Peace Conference, according to Senator Lodge, might not only cause delay, but might lead to divisions among the nations which have conquered Germany. The five principles to which he called particular attention were those relating to secret diplomacy, the freedom of the seas, economic barriers, the reduction of armaments, and the establishment of a League of Nations.

**France.**—As usual, the great Catholic daily paper of Paris, *La Croix*, is taking the initiative towards the formation of a group of Catholics, who while retaining their own personal political and social preferences, will nevertheless hold themselves ready to cooperate in the defense of Catholic and religious liberty. M. Jean Gui-

Catholic Organization



raud, writing in the issue of November 26, 1918, admits that it would be a chimerical dream to think of forming a Catholic party, pledged to think and act as a unit on the important subjects of reconstruction. It would need a miracle to unite into a single organization men of such divergent views as those held by French Catholics: Republicans, Royalists, Democrats, Liberals, Conservatives, and those who incline towards centralization; it would call for a more stupendous miracle to hold together such an organization, even were it successfully launched. French Catholics, with that true liberty of thought which has always been accorded her children by the Church, are divided on a multitude of questions, political, economic and social; they also disagree on the tactics to be employed.

M. Guiraud admits the situation. Nevertheless he points out that not only has the lack of cohesion among French Catholics in the matter of politics been the chief and most fundamental cause of their weakness and their subjection to persecution in the past, but also that there is noticeable everywhere at present a very marked impatience over the situation as it exists, and a demand for a satisfactory solution which will put an end to intolerable conditions. Leaving aside any hope for political party affiliation, he insists on the urgent necessity of organization on questions which concern the defense of Catholic rights and the restoration of those Christian principles which are essential to the prosperity of all nations and particularly the great nation of France. Catholics have the duty, he maintains, to take their share in the work of peace, first as citizens; but their obligation does not stop here, they owe a duty to their Catholic Faith, which is practically, at least in its effects, synonymous with their duty to their country. If they lift their voices merely as scattered, isolated, separate individuals, they will be as voices crying in the wilderness; if they unite on the common ground of Catholic ideals, retaining their independence where such ideals are not in question, they will exert a force of untold strength for the betterment of their country.

**Germany.**—The first serious practical step towards forming a stable government and bringing order out of the chaos that at times has brought Germany close to

*Soldiers' and Workmen's Congress*

the border of inextricable Russian confusion, was taken on December 16, when approximately 450 delegates representing the local Soldiers' and Workmen's Councils met in Congress at the Prussian Diet's Palace in Berlin. Liebknecht and Luxemburg, the leaders of the Spartacus group, were excluded from participating in the meeting even in the quality of guests, by a formal vote which defeated the resolution to admit them by a ballot of five to one. George Ledebour, the leader of the Independent Socialists, attacked Premier Ebert, but was silenced and then permitted to continue after violent protests. Although

sessions of a stormy nature have continued during the week, very little progress has been made, mainly on account of the continued efforts of the Spartacides and the Radicals to interfere with the proceedings.

One very important measure, however, was passed. On December 19 a motion to anticipate the date for the elections of members to the National Assembly, which is to succeed the Soldiers' and Workmen's Councils, from February 16 to January 19, received the approval of the Congress, the vote being some 400 to 40. The Congress also passed a resolution providing for the opening of negotiations with the Allies and the United States for the liberation of occupied territories, with a view to preparing for the elections. On December 20 the Revolutionary Parliament adjourned, giving full power to the Ebert Cabinet to manage German affairs. The authority of the Cabinet was further increased by the appointment of a National Central Executive Committee, composed of twenty-seven members, all of whom are Majority Socialists.

**Palestine.**—One of the important, though minor, problems which will have to be settled at the Peace Conference is the future status of Palestine. The passing of the Turkish domination has made this imperative and the American Jewish Congress, which recently was in session in Philadelphia, is taking practical steps to shape the movement in accordance with Jewish interests. Not only has it advocated the formation of a permanent Jewish congress to look after the Jews throughout the world, and especially in Russia where it is suggested that they should be given a personal or communal, not territorial, autonomy, but it has also formulated plans for sending a commission to Versailles to secure the maintenance of Jewish rights in every country.

The Congress also adopted a practically unanimous resolution to cooperate with the World Zionist Movement to obtain recognition for "the aspirations and historic claims of the Jewish people with regard to Palestine," and the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in the Holy Land under the trusteeship of Great Britain. The resolution was passed in the general sense of the peace aims of the Allies as enunciated in 1915 and 1916, and particularly along the lines affirmed by the British Government on November 2, 1917. The former plans were nullified by the disintegration of Russia, but the latter were formally endorsed by France, Italy and Serbia.

Similar movements have been noted in various nations. Great Britain, France and the United States, to judge from recent speeches by their prominent statesmen, have no desire whatever to annex Palestine, or to exercise domination over that country's government should it be given a separate existence at the Peace Conference. The suggestion, however, that the trusteeship should be given to Great Britain has aroused considerable unfavorable comment in France. The *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique*

has given expression to popular French views on the subject. It protests against anything like an abdication of the traditional French preponderance in affairs of the Levant, which has been uninterrupted through all the variations in French government, under the kingdom, the republic and the directory, from the time of the first treaty made in 1535 between Francis I, King of France, and the Sultan, Soliman II; it protests against the folly of accepting a narrow strip of sea coast in exchange for the rights and influence which it has exercised since the sixteenth century. The attitude of the native population who favor France above all other nations principally on account of the Catholic protectorate; the existence of numerous French establishments in Palestine, schools, colleges, universities, hospitals, orphanages, and religious houses, which in number far exceed the combined establishments of other nations; the money, interest and care which France has lavished on the Holy Land and which before the war gave her an unchallenged superiority; these are some of the reasons adduced to prove that France should not consent to abandon any of the privileges acquired through centuries. It is pointed out that the military successes of the British in Palestine were possible only because France did a lion's share of the fighting on other battlefields.

With regard to the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth, the French review points out that a religious restoration would mean the rebuilding of the Temple, and this in turn would involve the destruction of the beautiful Mosque of Omar, which occupies the same site as the ancient Temple. A return to the Mosaic Code would involve intolerance for non-Jews, and even the infusion of liberal ideas into the restoration of the Jewish nation, on account of the numerical superiority of other peoples, would leave them strangers in their own land. There are serious difficulties in the way of the scheme, even in the unlikely supposition that the Jews, who now claim religious affiliations rather than national ties, were to migrate in large numbers to the Holy Land from the lands of their birth. It is a matter susceptible of serious argument that some of the inhabitants of Palestine, for example the descendants of the ancient Chananians, have rights to the soil anterior to those of the Jews, these could not in any case be dispossessed of their property without just compensation, and might refuse to be transplanted. The injustice which the Peace Conference would allege to repair by creating a Jewish State in Palestine would seem to be outlawed by the fact that it dates back to the first and second centuries of the Christian era. Palestine, unless intensively cultivated yields only thorns, and the Jews as a people do not take to agriculture. In France it is clearly stated that there is no thought of hampering or paralyzing the legitimate development of the Jews or of blocking their just aspirations; but from the above considerations and others of a similar nature, the creation of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine seems highly impracticable.

**Russia.**—"Why are Allied troops still kept in Russia?" is the question recently put to the American and British Governments. On December 12 Senator Johnson of California, a Republican, asked the Senate why our soldiers are fighting in

*Whom Are the Allies  
Fighting?*

Russia, though no declaration of war has been made against that country. He asked for light on seven questions he put regarding our Russian policy, desiring to learn, among other things, if it is true that the United States made no reply to the Soviet Government's appeal to us to prevent the Brest-Latovsk treaty from being ratified, and if we contributed toward the success of the Bolshevik revolution by delaying to support Kerensky's Government. Senator Johnson then said:

I do not know our policy and I know no other man who knows our policy. I do know that we are killing Russians, and they, when they can, are killing ours, and that this we are doing upon Russian soil.

The extraordinary amount of misinformation given to the American people concerning Russia almost justifies the belief that there has been a regular and consistent propaganda of misrepresentation. The Creel Bureau of Public Information has apparently been engaged, not in developing facts to our people, but in justifying a course subsequently pursued at variance with our words. Let in the light on the Russian situation and let our people know the facts.

The British Government has also been asked by several prominent English papers to define its Russian policy. And when protests were made against the secrecy maintained regarding Allied military operations in Russia, Viscount Milner, the Secretary of War, wrote to a correspondent a defense of the Government, saying:

You ask me what right we ever had to send British troops to Russia to meddle with the internal affairs of that country and how long we mean to keep them there now that the war is over.

The question itself shows that you misapprehend the facts of the case as well as the motives of the Government. The reason why Allied, not merely British forces—indeed the British are only a small proportion of the total Allied troops—were sent to Russia is that the Bolsheviks, whatever their ultimate object, were in fact assisting our enemies in every possible way.

I say nothing of the enormous quantities of military stores, the property of the Allies, which were still lying at Archangel and Vladivostok and which were in course of being appropriated by the Bolsheviks and transferred to the Germans until the Allied occupation put an end to the process.

And this intervention was successful. Rioting was stopped. The Czecho-Slovaks were saved from destruction. The resources of Siberia and southeastern Russia were denied to the enemy. The northern ports of European Russia were prevented from becoming bases for German submarines from which our North Sea barrage could have been turned.

I say nothing of the fact that a vast portion of the earth's surface and millions of people friendly to the Allies have been spared the unspeakable horrors of Bolshevik rule. But in the course of this Allied intervention thousands of Russians have taken up arms and fought on the side of the Allies.

Meanwhile there seems to be no one qualified to speak for the Russian people at the Peace Conference. The Government at Omsk is now split into two factions, one of which violently opposes the dictator heading the other. The Allies do not recognize the Soviet Government.



## Three Bishops and Three Kings

JOHN C. REVILLE, S. J.

**I**N the consistorial allocution of July 28, 1915, Pope Benedict XV spoke a few words which should be taken to heart by all who in any way can contribute to the peace of the world. They should be remembered especially by those who now have the destinies of nations in their hands. "Remember," said the Holy Father, "that nations do not die. Humbled and oppressed they indignantly bear the yoke fastened upon them; they slowly prepare for the day of deliverance and transmit from generation to generation a grim heritage of hatred and revenge."

In this single sentence the Pontiff laid down a truth which history confirms. To act in opposition to it is to act in opposition to the laws of nature, and sooner or later nature will have her revenge. When her laws are outraged on a colossal scale, her revenge is in proportion to the enormity of the crime. National crimes draw down national retributions. An unjust war and still more so, perhaps, an unjust peace ever rankles in the heart of the victims. An unjust peace sows the seeds of future discords. It casts the dragon's teeth into furrows from which will rise files of armed men locked in battle. An unjust peace, a peace of revenge and mutilation, is in reality the first note of another declaration of war. It permanently mobilizes the spirit of hatred and revenge.

Against such a peace the Holy Father has sent his warning. "The Pope's War Work" describes what according to the Pontiff, a true peace should be. It is not the peace imposed, in his hour of triumph, by the conqueror, "who sword in hand smites down the weak and looks solely to his own interests. It is a peace in harmony with those principles of equity which God has engraved on the human conscience and which the religion of Christ has sanctioned and perfected." It is not a peace that leaves the sparks of discord smouldering under the embers, but an enduring peace, one whose inspiration is justice, one which respects the sentiment of nationality, and "whose aim is to reestablish in the world the reign of the charity of Christ and of Christian civilization."

The words of the Pope should form the groundwork of the decisions of the Peace Conference. They might well form the preamble of the charter of the League of Nations. Had such noble sentiments been heeded, wars which have deluged the world with blood would have been avoided. When France lay powerless before the armies of Prussia and the policies of Bismarck in 1871, and Alsace-Lorraine was about to be torn from the country to which she had belonged for 200 years, a French prelate, Charles-Emile Freppel, Bishop of Angers, addressed a bold appeal to William I, the King of Prussia. The letter was written after the French had been de-

feated at Sedan and Metz, when Paris was in the grip of the enemy, and France on the brink of ruin. Yet it breathes the noblest patriotism. It is bold without being arrogant, and joins to the language of an apostle and a bishop the views of an experienced statesman.

Victory, the Bishop writes to the King, has crowned your arms. Yours is the highest success that can come to a sovereign; your troops have conquered the armies of France. "Be not surprised then to hear a minister of the Gospel reminding you that you have one more victory to win; you must conquer yourself." Referring to the rumor that Alsace was to be handed over to Germany, the Bishop, Alsatian himself, begs the King to renounce a project which would be no less disastrous to Germany than to France. The province may be torn from the country with which it has been so long identified. In heart, in soul, in ideals, in aspirations it must and will remain French. "Hence, Sire, I make bold to ask your Majesty, what profit will accrue to Germany from the possession of a province ever drawn towards the motherland by its memories, its affections, its yearnings and its hopes?" The seizure and possession of Alsace "will be for Germany a source of weakness, not an element of strength, a permanent well-head of unrest, not a guarantee of tranquillity and peace. The France of the future cannot accept the odious sacrifice thus forced upon her."

Looking into that future the Bishop beholds the seeds of hatred sown in the heart of his countrymen. That violation of his country's integrity and honor will sooner or later cause another war, at a time when modern progress and civilization and the bonds of commerce and industry would seem to make such fratricidal strife an impossibility. History teaches that a durable peace is one that is profitable to the conqueror without exasperating the conquered. "If the King of Prussia refrains from annexing to Germany a province which in heart and soul is entirely French, he can bring about a lasting peace. France intact means a peace for many years to come; France mutilated means war. Between such alternatives the King of Prussia must not hesitate." Had these words been heeded one at least of the causes of the late war would have been eliminated.

The history of the Church gives us similar examples of pastoral frankness. There are few cities whose names have come up so often in the last months as Cambrai. The name brought back memories of an archbishop who 200 hundred years ago presided over its spiritual welfare. Thousands lovingly remember the gentle Fénelon and recall the days when they read the opening sentences of his "Telemachus." "The Swan of Cambrai," thus is the Archbishop known. Never was there a more tender-hearted and lovable priest. But the gentle are also strong. Theirs is the heart to kindle with indigna-

tion under injustice. Fénelon was no exception. In the very volumes which contain his letters full of a father's love to his pupil, the Duke of Bourgogne, grandson of Louis XIV, there is an historic letter to Louis himself. Some doubt has been cast upon its authenticity owing to a sentence or two which are hard to reconcile with what we know of the former life of Fénelon at court under the very eyes of Louis. The majority of critics, however, call the letter his.

In spite of the prevailing opinion that the court preachers of Louis XIV were afraid to tell him the truth, time and again Bourdaloue and Massillon spoke the plainest truths to the royal sinner. But Louis was never so sternly lectured as he was by the apostolic writer of the letter in question. Truth is strong and free, Fénelon tells him.

You have unfortunately not been accustomed to hear it. In spite of your noble qualities, because of your unfortunate training, your Government has served only to further your selfish ends. For thirty years your Ministers have overthrown all the old laws and principles of the kingdom, to exalt your authority. They have lifted you up on the ruins of all the ranks and orders of the realm, as if you could achieve greatness by ruining your subjects, on whom your greatness must be founded. They have made your name odious: thanks to them the whole French nation is an object of hatred to its neighbors.

This is no exordium to tickle the vanity of the monarch. The beginning of the letter promises on the contrary some rather startling disclosures. They are not slow to come. The letter was written probably either after the sea-fight of La Hogue, familiar to English readers through Browning's "Hervé Riel," in which the French fleet under Tourville, was seriously crippled by the Anglo-Dutch, or after the capture of the French East-Indian colony of Pondichery by the Dutch. It was a time for sober reflexion. Fénelon helped the King to make a little examination of conscience. He asks the monarch to go back to the Dutch War of 1672. He tells him fearlessly that it was undertaken for frivolous and unjust reasons, that it was the cause of all its other wars, and that the territories which it added to France were unjustly acquired. Though Fénelon admits that a subsequent treaty seemed to consecrate this act of injustice, since it gave him the conquered territory, he reminds Louis that "an unjust war does not cease to be unjust because it is successful." In words which startlingly resemble those of Benedict XV and Bishop Freppel, he writes:

Treaties of peace signed by the conquered are never freely signed. The conquered sign them with the knife at their throat. They sign them in spite of themselves and to avoid greater losses. They sign them just as a man must hand over his purse to a highwayman, when he must either do so or die. You must then, Sire, go back to the origin of the Dutch War in order to examine your conquests before God.

The prelate helps him to refresh his memory:

All the frightful disasters which for the last twenty years have desolated Europe, all the blood shed, all the scandals which have taken place, the provinces plundered, the towns and the

villages reduced to ashes, are one and all the sad results of this war of 1672.

That war is the source of all the present evils, he tells the prince. You dictate an unjust peace. In the very act of making peace you declare war, because your terms are unfair and cruel. So true is this that your enemies prefer to fight you openly in war rather than conclude peace with you, because they know that the peace made at the point of the sword will not be a real and lasting one.

In these words the Archbishop of Cambrai shows himself a real statesman. But he is also a patriot, and the sorrows of his country wring from him words of deepest pathos. Your people, he informs Louis, as La Bruyère was to tell him, though indirectly, are dying of hunger. The fields are deserted, town and country are depopulated. You have destroyed one-half of the real strength of your kingdom. Yet you are blindfolded to these evils. Referring to Marshal de Luxembourg's brilliant but flimsy victories at Steenkirk and Neerwinden, he adds a few words which might have gone home to William of Hohenzollern had he read them some time between March 21 and the middle of July, 1918.

While after a terrible struggle you remain master on the field of battle and capture the guns of the enemy, while you take towns and cities, you do not remember that you are fighting on ground which is crumbling under your feet and that in spite of all your victories you will fall.

In this arraignment of the policy of Louis, who, as Fénelon says, "loves only himself," acts as if he were "a God on earth," and as if "everything else on earth has been created to be sacrificed for him," the priest, the Bishop, the father speaks. The King must be told the truth; he must humble himself under the hand of God; he must give peace and rest to his suffering people.

History repeats itself. As long as there will be princes like the Henrys of England and of Germany, like Louis of France or the Hohenzollerns of modern days, there will be men like Ambrose and Thomas à Becket and Gregory VII, Mercier and Freppel and Fénelon to plead for outraged justice. The see of Cambrai gave us in the late war another example of episcopal courage. In Cambrai, as in the cities of Belgium, the German authorities had ordered the Bishops and priests to surrender the church bells to furnish materials for German arms. The world knows how Cardinal Mercier protested against the injustice. It does not know quite so well of the letter of protest sent to the Kaiser by the Archbishop of Cambrai, Mgr. Chollet. It is a brave letter, breathing the spirit of those gallant Bishops, Frauenberg of Mechlin and De Broglie of Ghent, who were not afraid to withstand the encroachments of Austrian statesmen and of Napoleonic tyranny.

After exposing the odious character of the order the Archbishop paints a striking picture of the ravages of the German invasion. Everywhere he sees:

excessive requisitions and unlawful confiscations; homes violated and rifled; people turned out of their dwellings; furniture



scattered or carried off; exorbitant fines; prisons filled with innocent people; fortification-work imposed upon us against our own country under pain of punishments unknown to any code. The clergy are suspect; the priests are deprived of most of their churches. . . . The country is ruined. . . . Trade, industry and agriculture are brought to nothing.

The factories, he adds, have been robbed of their machines, the very ploughs in the fields have been carried off, the milch cows taken from their sheds, and one of the most fertile countries of Europe must rely for support on the charity of strangers. He thus concludes the picture:

The villages have been razed to the ground; the trees of the forest have been shattered; the fruit trees killed, things forbidden by God to be touched even among peoples whom He had ordered to be put to the sword.

William of Hohenzollern received the letter of the Archbishop, but sent back word that it was too long to read. In his exile at Amerongen he will surely have the ten minutes leisure which the perusal of the letter requires. Amid the wreck of his arrogant hopes and

thwarted designs he will read with bitter memories and regret the eloquent words of a Catholic priest and archbishop. He will rue the hour when he rejected a plea made in the name of humanity and justice. These words written by Archbishop Chollet must now sound ominous in the ears of the disillusioned war-lord:

Sire, the tears and curses of a whole people are a heavy burden to carry, the weight of which your Majesty will not care to have lying upon your dynasty or your Empire. If you think that international conventions may be denounced, you also know that above all conventions there are principles and laws which cannot either be denounced or abrogated, the laws of justice and humanity, and the principle of the supremacy of right over might. These principles and laws, if they be violated, are their own avengers.

To that warning William II of Germany, like his grandfather, and Louis XIV in similar circumstances, turned a deaf ear. But the Archbishop's prophecy did not go unfulfilled. Law and justice have shown that they could defend themselves. They have been their own swift and merciless avengers.

## The Two Traditions of Liberty

MOORHOUSE I. X. MILLAR, S.J.

**T**HE magnificent example our country has lately furnished of the generous power and efficiency of truly democratic ideals has been the cause of no little wonderment even to our own minds. Yet we should not for a moment allow ourselves to imagine that, by arguing from our own point of view, we can easily fathom the reasons for the deep and genuine surprise awakened in Europe and throughout the world. For the average American it is no doubt difficult to realize how fully the outside world looked upon us more in the nature of an experiment than as a people that had attained to definite nationality. We appeared to be living as though our true greatness still lay somewhere in the future. Wealth and the pursuit of wealth seemed to constitute our chief, if not our sole, claim to be ranked as a world power. But in the words of Frederic Harrison writing about us in 1901, the problem for the thoughtful visitor was whether this vast prosperity, this boundless future, rested "upon an equal expansion in the social, intellectual and moral sphere."

With the war came the sudden challenge to our real spirit as a nation. What our own loyalty more than half expected has been revealed in fact. It is no longer our wealth that Europe admires, but our manhood, our character and the liberty which has enabled us to develop into what we have shown ourselves. As a democracy we now stand preeminent among the nations and our Constitution and our traditions are about to become the study and model for the new governments soon to be shaped out of the old-world chaos. Therefore the great international problem, as it presents itself to us is: Can we

explain ourselves, or is our answer to be as simple and unsatisfactory as that of Topsy?

To many such a question may seem entirely superfluous and even impertinent. Not so to those, however, who for years past have with matured judgment been watching the trend of events.

That eternal vigilance [said Elihu Root in January, 1916] is the price of liberty is such a truism that it has lost its meaning, but it is an eternal truth, and the principles of American liberty stand in need of a renewed devotion on the part of the American people.

Nor is this note of warning solitary in its expression. It is being sounded by almost every conscientious and competent thinker of whatever party or political creed. The real grounds moreover for this deep concern were further pointed out by the same person from whose address at the State Bar Association dinner we have just quoted:

We must be prepared to defend it [our American liberty] within as against all indifference and false doctrine, against all willingness to submit individual independence to the control of practical tyranny whether it be of a monarch or a majority.

Then having passed in review some of the dangers that followed from immigration he made his meaning still more definite in these words:

The change may well be seen in our colleges and law schools, where there are many professors who think they know better what law ought to be and what the principles of jurisprudence ought to be, and what the political institutions ought to be, than the people of England and America, working out their laws through centuries of life. And these men, who think they know it all, these half-baked and conceited theorists are teaching the boys in our law schools to despise American institutions.

Strong as this indictment may sound, few we think can doubt its truth, now that we have come to realize to what extent German philosophy and German ideas had crept in among us. To lay the blame at Germany's door is, however, no sufficient explanation. The real point is, why did we not have a philosophy of our own, truly in keeping with American liberty and American institutions? The full and adequate answer to this is so simple on the face of it, once the facts in the case are adverted to, that the wonder is that it has never, to our knowledge, been insisted on before. One need only look back over the last 400 years of what is now miscalled Christendom, in order to detect not one, but a twofold tradition of liberty, each with a distinct philosophy of its own. The first, both in order of time and in the soundness of its fundamental principles, may be rightly called the medieval tradition, and it is that of England and America. The other, in large measure a mere parasite, admits of no other title but that of Protestant, and while manifesting itself in antagonism to the former pretty much everywhere, its stronghold, since the French Revolution, has been the Western Continent of Europe. The important thing, however, about both these traditions is the philosophy on which each subsists. If the "false doctrine" to which Elihu Root alludes has been allowed to gain a hold upon the nation it has been due to the confusing Protestant assumption that it was the Reformation that brought liberty into the world. In other words, failing to make the distinction between the two traditions, we have been endeavoring to support our own legitimate inheritance together with the institutions in which it is embodied on a wholly alien body of principles.

That the latter came into currency at the Reformation is true enough. That they differ entirely, on the other hand, from the principles of those who laid the solid foundations of our liberty in our Constitution may be readily seen by comparing them even on the basis of such a cursory historical review as the space still left us will alone permit. To simplify matters, moreover, we will confine ourselves to the fundamental test-point of legal obligation.

To begin, then, with Calvin, it should be kept clearly in mind that he maintained that civil laws do not oblige in conscience. The logical outcome of the conception of the order of things implicit in such a contention is the theory of the French Calvinist, Pierre Jurieu, who in his controversy with Bossuet (1680) plainly stated: "There must be in every society some authority that need not have reason on its side in order to validate its acts. And such authority resides only in the people." In other words, he merely transferred to the people what those, who in England were at this same period preaching the Divine right of kings, wished to reserve as the special privilege of a single individual, viz., the right to do wrong. How far Rousseau may have been directly indebted to Jurieu is not quite evident. The important

point is that his view was essentially the same. His *Contrat Social* is a Calvinist's idealization of a Calvinistic commonwealth and, except for the flattering ease with which it admitted of a flattering interpretation, it became, as we know, in the hands of the French revolutionists pretty much what the Bible had been in the hands of the Puritans during the Puritan Revolution in England. As Burke, moreover, pointed out, when speaking of the Puritans in this country,

The dissenting interests have sprung up in direct opposition to all the ordinary powers of the world; and could justify that opposition only on a strong claim to natural liberty. Their very existence depended on the powerful and unremitted assertion of that claim. All Protestantism, even the most cold and passive, is a sort of dissent. But the religion most prevalent in our northern colonies is a refinement on the principle of resistance; it is the dissidence of dissent; and the Protestantism of the Protestant religion.

It is on the fact thus clearly stated that many still persist in the assumption of a Protestant origin for our American liberties. But the reply is not far to seek. The logical conclusion from such a conception of liberty is none other than that drawn by Kant from the premises he adopted from Rousseau: "Right and the power of coercion are one and the same thing."

That this conception was utterly foreign to the framers of our Constitution is evident from the following words in Washington's Farewell Address (1796):

Respect for its [the Government's] authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and alter their constitutions of government; but the constitution which at any time exists, till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

Lest it should still be thought that the people can do no wrong he adds somewhat further on:

Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation, in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles.

The answer of some may, of course, be that these were Washington's own personal views and that therefore they are not truly implicit in our Constitution. But this would be to lose sight of a fact not sufficiently emphasized, viz., that the framers of our Constitution were not so much adherents to the Protestant as to the Whig tradition of liberty. "This glorious spirit of Whiggism," said Chatham in January, 1775, "animates 3,000,000 in America, who prefer poverty with liberty to gilded chains and sordid affluence, and who will die in defense of their rights as freemen." The best comment, therefore, on the words of Washington are these from Burke, the



greatest exponent of Whig principles living at the time. In the "Appeal from the New Whigs to the Old" (1791), where a clear distinction is drawn between the two philosophies we have been insisting on, he says:

I allow, that if no supreme ruler exists, wise to form and potent to enforce the moral law, there is no sanction to any contract, virtual or even actual, against the will of prevalent power. On that hypothesis, let any set of men be strong enough to set their duties at defiance, and they cease to be duties any longer. . . . Taking it for granted that I do not write to the disciples of the Parisian philosophy (i.e., of Rousseau, etc.), I may assume, that the awful Author of our being is the Author of our place in the order of existence; and that having disposed and marshaled us by a Divine tactic, not according to our will, but according to His, He has, in and by that disposition, virtually subjected us to act the part which belongs to the place assigned us. We have obligations to mankind at large, which are not in consequence of any special voluntary pact. They arise from the relation of man to man, and the relation of man to God, which relations are not matters of choice. On the contrary, the force of all pacts which we enter into with any particular person or number of persons amongst mankind, depends upon those prior obligations. In some cases the subordinate relations are voluntary, in others they are necessary—but the duties of all are compulsive.

Now such Whig principles were by no means Protestant in their origin, but rather medieval, and this we hope to show in another article. For the present it will be sufficient if we have succeeded in some small degree in making it clear that "the principles of American liberty" are in no way identical with those so loudly advertised by so-called modern liberals under such misleading labels as, "*Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité*."

## The Pope and Prison-Bars

J. HARDING FISHER, S.J.

A FORMER paper gave the general outlines of the early steps taken by the Pope to effect an exchange of civil prisoners of war, and of the response given to his note of January 11, 1915, by the belligerent nations. His part in the final solution of difficulties which stood in the way of the complete success of his benevolent purpose was still more striking.

For a time it seemed as if Germany and Great Britain would not come to terms. The Minister Plenipotentiary of Prussia to the Vatican, Dr. Otto von Muehlberg, informed Cardinal Gasparri that his Government insisted that male adults above the age of forty-five years should be exchanged, but that Great Britain fixed the age limit ten years higher. Neither nation would yield on this point, but Great Britain appealed to the Holy Father to use his influence with Germany in order to secure at least the exchange of all male adults who were unfit to bear arms. The Pope hastened to do so, with the result that the Minister of Prussia, in a note dated February 26, 1915, expressed his Government's complete acceptance of this modified Papal request. Sir Henry Howard communicated this reply to London on March 3, 1915, and the following day expressed his Government's deep

gratitude for the Holy Father's humane action. The matter seemed to be definitely settled and steps were immediately taken, with the American Ambassador at London as an intermediary, to put the agreement into execution, when a new dispute arose and threatened to undo all that had been accomplished.

Great Britain, having captured the crews of the German submarines U-8 and U-12, refused to treat them like other prisoners. Germany at once asked Sir Edward Grey, through the Ambassador of the United States, if this were true, adding that, if it were a fact, retaliation would be resorted to by meting out harsher treatment to the captured members of British submarine crews. Sir Edward Grey informed Mr. William H. Page that the methods used by Germany in carrying on submarine warfare put German submarine crews outside the pale of honorable combatants; he further declared that the British had rescued more than 1,000 German officers and sailors, whereas there was not a single instance on record of British officers or sailors having been rescued by Germans. On receiving this reply Germany proceeded to carry out the threatened reprisals, and informed the Vatican of the suspension of the consent to the exchange of civil prisoners unfit for military service, which had previously been given, "thanks to the intervention of the Holy See."

These reprisals failed to find favor with men of moderate views in either country, and it was proposed that the United States and the Holy See should point out to the two Governments the uselessness of such measures. Tentative suggestions of an unofficial nature were made to a member of the American diplomatic corps, without receiving much encouragement, but the Holy See at once took up the matter. Great Britain was persuaded to treat the German submarine crews like other prisoners, and Germany to consent to return to the former method of treating prisoners taken from British submarines. On August 4, 1915, the German Government renewed its acceptance of the Papal proposal for the exchange, without limit of age, of male civil prisoners unfit for military service, and on August 12, 1915, Great Britain again "thanked the Holy Father most cordially for his benevolent and humanitarian action."

Further efforts were made by the Pope to get the two countries to agree on an age limit for the exchange of civil prisoners of war who were fit for military service, but neither nation would make concessions. The main point of difference, however, had already been settled, and the merit for this belongs to the Holy See.

The tone of the first reply made by France to the proposal of the Holy See seemed to preclude the possibility of further negotiations. The communication of the French Republic which was addressed to the British Ambassador on February 1, 1915, and was forwarded by Sir Henry Howard to Cardinal Gasparri on February 24, 1915, declared that France could not come to any agreement with either Austria or Germany until

these Governments ceased from their many violations of the law of nations in regard to civilians, many proofs of these violations being in possession of the French Government for the inspection of the Allies. When the civil populations of France, the reply stated, who had been led into captivity far from their native land, in defiance of the law of nations, had been restored, the French Government would examine the proposal of the Vatican in a broad and conciliatory spirit, then and not till then. Germany had failed to carry out the reciprocal agreements arrived at with Alsace-Lorraine, Belgium and Luxemburg.

In spite of the decided stand taken in this reply, the Holy See did not lose hope, and in the event an agreement was finally reached along the lines suggested. It took a long while to effect a settlement, but it was finally concluded on January 13, 1916. On the twenty-seventh of the same month Cardinal Felix von Hartmann, Archbishop of Cologne, wrote to Mgr. Pacelli, Secretary of the Congregation for Extraordinary Affairs, to say that France and Germany had agreed to the Holy Father's proposal. Some days later, on February 11, 1916, Mgr. Francesco Marchetti Selvaggiani, Special Envoy of the Holy See at Berne, sent the same message, adding that the negotiations had been carried on through the kind offices of Spain and Switzerland, and that the first exchange had already taken place, 1,600 French and 3,000 German civil prisoners being free to return to their native lands. A little more than a month afterwards 20,000 French civil prisoners, mostly women and children, were allowed to depart from the occupied portions of France, and after passing through Switzerland they arrived in Southern France.

The Holy Father's part in adjusting the dispute between Turkey and Great Britain has been studied almost entirely from the documents sent by Mgr. Dolci to the Vatican. For some reason the Vatican archives, which were opened to the *Civiltà Cattolica*, were found to contain very little in the form of documentary evidence written by the representatives of the Allies. Materials for a coherent history of the steps taken by the Pope, however, are available. From the very beginning the Ottoman Empire showed itself in entire accord with the Papal proposal for an exchange of civil prisoners, and made suggestions on the matter to the Governments of the Entente. Full freedom was given by Turkey to women and children to depart, and only one modification was made in the Holy Father's proposal, namely, that the age limits for men should be sixteen and fifty.

Great Britain, according to Turkey's story, demanded the freedom of all British civilian prisoners, but was willing to give freedom to only two prisoners of the Ottoman nation. Neither France nor Russia made any reply to the Turkish note. Naturally the Government of the Sublime Porte desisted from further negotiations. The Holy See, however, persisted. On August 20, 1915, the Cardinal Secretary of State asked the Apostolic

Delegate at Constantinople to obtain from Turkey the liberation of the French civilians who were detained as hostages at Beirut, Damascus and Ourfa, or at least of those hostages who were under seventeen or over fifty years of age, or were invalided.

Mgr. Dolci approached Ahmed Rêchid on the subject, but found the Turkish Government highly incensed against the Entente. The Director of Political Affairs informed the Apostolic Delegate that France had treated the natives of Armenia and Syria, who were Christians or Mohammedans, as free French citizens, but had interned the rest of the Ottoman subjects in a concentration camp at Carcassone. He declared that Great Britain had made the proposal, which he characterized as ridiculous, that two Ottoman prisoners should be exchanged for all the British prisoners; and that the unjust treatment of a member of the Turkish diplomatic corps at London, and the firing by the British fleet on certain villages and the attempt to torpedo transports carrying wounded soldiers, merely because they were flying the Red Crescent instead of the Red Cross, had been answered by permission being given to the Turkish officers to exact reprisals. Continued threats made against the Turks by both British and French to hold the members of the Turkish Cabinet personally responsible for these reprisals had further embittered the Turks. Accordingly Mgr. Dolci wrote to the Vatican and expressed his opinion that the affair was almost hopeless. This was on August 23, 1915.

Five days later he had a conference with Enver Pasha and asked the Turkish Government to agree to the Holy Father's suggestion out of consideration for the Pope. The Minister of War replied that already his Government had liberated M. Brané out of deference to the Holy Father, but further concessions were impossible; nevertheless Turkey was desirous of having the Pope interest himself in Turkish civil prisoners.

On October 23, 1915, the Cardinal Secretary of State addressed a communication to Sir Henry Howard, begging him to persuade the British Government to consent to the proposed exchange of British and Ottoman subjects. The request of the Holy See eventually bore fruit, not, however, until eight months later. On June 12, 1916, the Cardinal Secretary of State recommended to Sir Henry Howard the repatriation of Ayoub Sabri, a Turkish subject; Great Britain delayed answering this request, but finally, on July 27, 1916, declared that his British Majesty was ready to agree to an exchange not only of Ayoub Sabri, but of all interned civil prisoners, both Turkish and British. The Holy See was asked to effect the exchange. Two days afterward the news was communicated to Constantinople and soon after the exchange took place. Thus ends the second phase of the Holy Father's efforts in behalf of suffering men, women and children; the third phase, which will be described in a coming paper, are his endeavors to secure the release of interned and deported Belgians.



## The Opening Age

EDWARD F. GARESCHÉ, S.J.

FROM every Catholic heart the cry and prayer should go up without ceasing these momentous days: "God give us men to guide the opening age!" With the advent of peace and the release of the immense energies which have been directed with such fearful efficiency to the work of destruction, there will come a great revulsion in the minds of men and a feverish activity to rebuild and restore what the war has pulled down, or rather to rear better and more perfect things in place of those destroyed.

After some great fire or earthquake there comes a desire for reconstruction that sometimes carries the city far beyond the glories of its former state.

The world is recovering now from the shock of a stunning cataclysm, and all the vital forces of mankind will react with tremendous energy to build up and beautify the earth. This reconstructive energy is to go out into every field. In statesmanship the cry is democracy, and here the war has only hastened the age-long tendency fostered by the Church. There must be vast social reforms. Justice and individual opportunity are to be given to families and individuals as to nations, and there will be a searching of principles and a weighing of theories in social spheres that will sift out much of the chaff, even though the sound wheat of Catholic principle which alone can nourish a famished and eager world be not entirely uncovered. In literature, in art, in science, in every urge of human effort, there will be new life, motion, energy. Consider the profound reactions and the stimulus of past wars in every field of effort and then conjecture what we shall see in all human probability now that this struggle is ended. If those lesser conflicts loosened the souls of men and shook them from their crusted idleness, what can we expect from this greatest of all wars which has made ancient battles dwindle into skirmishes, and made even the French laugh at Waterloo.

In the obvious order of things this nation should bear a part altogether glorious and great in the opening era after the war. For we have been stirred but have not been scorched by the great fire of conflict. The best youths of England, France, Italy, and of their Allies and enemies in this struggle lie mouldering on the glorious fields where they lived all their young lives in one tremendous hour and died with their songs unspoken and their deeds un-lived. But our youth, immensely moved, matured, instructed, disciplined, inspired by their part in this conflict, are still splendidly alive and will come home, by the grace of God, with a new outlook on life and on the world. Something of the old culture of Europe, of her immense patience, of her love of beauty, of the

traditions that make her very ruins lovely and give her cities almost a soul, will have, even imperceptibly, yet greatly, leavened their minds and their hearts. They will have seen that the tremendous rush for material comfort and prosperity that was fast ruining our national mind and heart is not altogether worthy of a great people. They will have caught from the quiet Catholic atmosphere of rural France the sweet infection of old Catholic thoughts and feelings that will work, in their young, passionate blood, into a great fever of holy admiration for all that is true, lasting, beautiful, wholesome and serene.

Our country has never seen a time when the full appeal of Catholic doctrine, principle, tradition could be brought so strongly to bear on the fine and true spirits outside the fold as now, when the war has shown the strength and loyalty of the Catholic body in the United States and has brought the flower of our young men in intimate contact with Catholicism abroad. The word Catholic has a new meaning in the minds of a million young men, who have seen the wayside crucifixes of sweet France, the village shrines and the populous cathedrals, and marked how intimately woven is the Catholic Faith with all the life of the people whose every noble trait blossoms brightest in the shadow of their cathedrals and their shrines. In Belgium, France, Italy, these shrewd young American eyes will not have failed to observe that the people for whom they were fighting, the common people who make the nation, are profoundly Catholic. And it is the people whom they love and admire and not the accidental persons whom they find in showy places or in formal ceremonies. The doors of the hearts of these young men are open as never before to the Catholic religion.

When they come home again, their energies immense, their desire of achievement heightened by what they have seen in Europe, their powers deepened and their industry whetted by long abstinence from the activities of civilian life, if we can but catch them up in some vast movement of truly Catholic reconstruction, guide their keen interest and their high aspirations along those Heaven-given courses which only can bring enduring accomplishment, put them in possession of the rich, secure achievement of Catholic thinkers and planners in the past and send them out into the nation, balanced, secure, with a compass and a rudder of faith and principle, then we may hope to see even in our day a revival of something of that union of deep faith and high achievement which made the best days of the Middle Ages so glorious.

It is only our cowardice and sloth that put all the

glorious pages of the Church's history in the past. Why should there not be eras to come more shining and magnificent with Catholic achievement than any that have gone? Granted leaders who can inspire and then guide and sustain, we have the material of hearts, intelligences, imaginations and all else that makes great men with which to reproduce here in this new world all the greatest glories of the old. Our one vast need will be consummate leadership. We shall have to besiege Heaven for brave men like those mighty ones of old, who could fire a whole people with faith and courage, and then work out in the agonizing trials of petty details the shining fabric of success. The young men are ready as never before: ours to seize the glowing hour, before the metal cools, and fashion it to Catholic forms.

Among those who have stayed at home there is likewise a new receptiveness to Catholic teaching and suggestion. A vast curiosity at least is in the rear of men's thoughts concerning the true meaning and teaching of this age-long Church which has suddenly showed such young efficacy and vigor, here and in other warring lands. Old barriers of insuperable prejudice have fallen down, unremarked in the swift rush of wartime activities. One has seen elements and influences thought hostile to the Church waking and rubbing their eyes as they looked at the undeniable efficiency and obvious holiness of an institution which they had simply known as an impossible and obsolete survival of old superstitions. It is difficult for us who are Catholics to realize what some otherwise intelligent outsiders thought of the Church and what a revolution it is in their thoughts to concede that she is a living force for good almost unequalled—the "almost" is theirs—on the earth.

Therefore when the great buzz and stir of rebuilding comes, and the interchange and counterchange of ideas begins, these newly awakened folk will begin too to inquire what the Church has to say and to suggest on every ethical and religious problem that comes up in the course of planning and discussion. But they will wish to know, not in the terms in which great minds of the past have formulated Catholic teaching, but in the speech and with the illustrations of contemporary life. What we need is Catholic intellectual leadership to interpret in a way they can understand the deep, eternal truths of Catholic ethics, dogma, which are a guide to the reconstructive activities of all time. Without changing a jot of the unchangeable truth, new series of interpretations can be given to Catholic dogma, morals, ethics, with explanations that will catch the ear of the intelligent non-Catholic, give him in his own idiom the solid gist of Catholic doctrine and appeal to him with the simple eloquence that truth always has when presented in the proper way.

The thrilling opportunities of the time should stir us to the depths of our soul's capacity for enthusiasm, energy and sacrifice. Our response should be a great increase of personal effort in all the unselfish ways before us.

Our realization of the needs and chances of the Church and the world should stir us to the utmost of personal effort, and in particular to that highest and most effective of all forms of personal effort, prayer for great leaders of the Church and the nation in this opening age.

## Zionism and the New Jerusalem

HENRY E. O'KEEFE, C.S.P.

“WHERE is He that is born King of the Jews? For we have seen His star in the East.” This Gentile cry, once piercing the far ways of Persia and Arabia, bids fair to echo in Jewish hearts which are throbbing not only in Russia, Rumania or Poland, but in the alleys and side-streets of our metropolitan city. There is a star hanging in the sky over the Holy Land, and the modern Zionists, consumed with a high passion, are building better than they know. Suetonius and Tacitus wrote that the wisdom of both East and West believed Judea to be the birthplace of men who would rule the world.

All that is fundamentally spiritual shoots from the imperishable stock of the Hebrew race. The evidence of the Divinity of Christianity is in a measure the evidence of the Divinity of Judaism. There is a rigid principle of continuity running clean through the two systems, at least, with that authentic and integral system which we call Catholicism. So constructive a mind as Cardinal Newman's reasons that Christianity clears up the mystery which hangs over Judaism. He hails Jerusalem as the classical home of the religious principle which absorbs all fundamental religions. Christianity absorbs them all, Judaism included. Rome belongs to the Jew as does Jerusalem to the Christian. That Jerusalem and Jesus are not national or racial was the perpetual cry of him who was Saul of Tarsus and a Jew of Jews. Rome, too, is as universal as Jerusalem is Catholic. Only Rome could, without an offensive anachronism, plant an Egyptian obelisk in the piazza before the dome of St. Peter's or bestow on a Hebrew convert the vision to institute a religious organization.

He who was of the tribe of Benjamin, already perceiving the impending dispersion of his race to the poles of the earth, could not believe that his people would be forever cast out. The Gentile is of the wild olive which has been grafted in the original tree. The sap and warm blood must thrill in the limbs of each that each may live.

Zionism is no longer a golden dream. Jerusalem is delivered in a manner that reaches to the roots of civilization. It is not the Jerusalem of Tasso, nor, indeed, the Jerusalem of the five Popes who struggled some 600 years ago to slacken the iron grip of the Turk; it is a new Jerusalem, even for the American Jew.

With a fine sense of historic proportion British diplomacy has not averred but presumed that the Holy Land belongs to no man or nation. No flag floats over it. The sites of the temples and all the sacred places cannot totally belong to the Jew, no more than that Christ is his sole possession. But the Zionist with his wealth and sentiment can now lift the tragic shadow hanging over his race in that mysterious country. This is to be consummated by the amalgamation of the most hostile, yet religious peoples, wandering over the face of the earth. Zionism is even now accepted by international agreement. It is to be financed by Jewish colonial trusts which have existed for a decade of years.

Zionism is not an historic rhapsody. It is a practical movement to ameliorate the religious, economic and agricultural



status of the Palestinian Jew. But again it is more than this. The intuitive genius of the race, doubtless provoked by centuries of persecution, is now touched with reverence for a romantic and unparalleled, historic antecedent. It is racial but religious, since the racial is so much a part of the religious. The creed is in the blood. The barrier of social convention and the deeply founded antipathy, glistening like a sharp sword, between Jew and Gentile will, in the courts of Jerusalem, be put into its scabbard.

Not excepting the English, the American Jew has less of the unassimilative strain in relation with the Gentile type. Naturally the dissolution of this strain is slow and sooner effected by our more democratic mode of life, education and social relationship. Much American anti-Semitism has been worn away by the constant association of Jew and Gentile in army camps at home, and in the close trenches and battlefields of France. Interesting it is that American Jews are among the most ardent Zionists. A superficial observer would reason otherwise, presuming that their prodigious material success in the American Republic would constrain them to forget the ancient glories of Israel. If America is the melting-pot of Europe, then Jerusalem is to be the melting pot of both America and Europe.

How can it be otherwise, if Jewish Palestine is to be held in trust by Western civilization and developed and safeguarded by international polity? It is the shrine where must meet in amicable mood the Mahometan, the Jew, the Christian pilgrim and student to contemplate the sages, prophets, poets and saints who belong to all humanity. This world-wide constituency will perforce break the racial and religious conflict. The fundamental religions will be drawn to one center; comparisons will be drawn within the area of Golgotha, where was lifted up He who would draw all nations unto Himself.

In that hour the Jew will take up the golden thread of his portentous history. We may say what we will of Greece and Rome but Theism was and must be the life of the Jew. His acute commercialism is incidental. Cardinal Newman, in his enigmatic but nevertheless illuminating work, "The Grammar of Assent" writes, that to him the last age of Jewish history is as strange as the first. But he is convinced that this chosen people, "did sin and whatever their sin was, is corroborated by the well-known chapter in the 'Book of Deuteronomy,' which so strikingly anticipates the nature of their punishment. That passage translated into Greek, as many as 350 years before the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, has on it the marks of a wonderful prophecy."

But now by a sudden twist in history, Jerusalem is free. Is this freedom to unravel the racial and religious entanglement of Jew and Gentile? Is Zionism, exclusive of its sociological purpose, to react to the significance of the Mosaic Covenant and the Messianic Idea? How can it do otherwise? These aspirations are woven in the fabric of Judaism. Its sublime literature, the expression of its soul, is replete with these undying hopes. Is it unreasoning optimism to believe that the eagle, that shattered the nest of her young and drove them out on the winds of heaven, has hovered over them and is now spreading her wings to bear them back? Is Zionism an adumbration of some historic religious boon to be vouchsafed to modern Judaism?

"The Lord thy God will bring back again thy captivity and will have mercy on thee and gather thee again out of all the nations, into which He scattereth thee before.

"If thou be driven as far as the poles of heaven, the Lord thy God will fetch thee back from thence.

"And will take thee to Himself and bring thee into the land, which thy fathers possessed and thou shalt possess it: and blessing thee He will make thee more numerous than were thy fathers."

## The Red Badge of Courage

JAMES LOUIS SMALL

SOMEBODY, I forget now who it was, once wrote a book and called it "The Red Badge of Courage." The phrase flashed across my mind the other evening while the band was playing retreat at the base hospital. The strains of "Over There" sounded bravely from the drill ground, as the sun sank majestically behind the purple hills. In front of the hospital stood a group of nurses, white-capped, with capes thrown back, so that the scarlet beneath showed in vivid contrast to the dull brown of the earth underfoot and the sober uniforms of the doctors standing in ranks upon the porch.

Of how very much, thought I to myself, is that red symbolic! Often and often it occurs to me that of all who have enlisted in the ranks the nurse is less praised than others. Public speakers generally pass her by; newspapers celebrate her but occasionally; and the popular martial songs of the day make little, if indeed any, mention of her. Yet how would the war have been won without her? One of the camp-welfare organizations has a double motto in its building that first provokes a smile and then a thought: "What Is Home Without a Soldier? What is Camp Without a Nurse?"

What, indeed? If there are those in civil life—and we fear there are—who imagine that an army nurse's life consists in one long round of glory, its principal occupation being, as one witty woman said, "holding a sick soldier's hand," then they had best disabuse themselves of that notion as quickly as possible. As a matter of bare fact she lives in barracks, like any other soldier; she partakes of the abundant and nourishing food provided by the good U. S. A.; she works long hours at somewhat less than half the pay she would receive in civil life; with a uniform, not an inexpensive one, to furnish from her meager savings. Yet how magnificently she gives, this modest little girl! She gives daily of her strength, her tact, her patience, and she gives to every agency of relief that asks for her support. During the late United War Work Campaign the welfare workers, forced into the task because there was no one else to undertake the duty, sat at the nurses' mess at the base hospital at Camp Dodge and wrote receipts for \$490, the total afterwards ran up to over \$600, and this from girls who had, during the worst epidemic this country has known for many a year, walked with sublime courage into places where the stoutest-hearted might well fear to tread.

And our Catholic nurses, what of them? To them hundreds of souls have during the past weeks owed a happy flight into eternity. Their fervor and devotion to the Faith is a rebuke to the spiritual idler and the drone. When one finds them eager for Mass, eager for additional opportunities for receiving the Bread of Life, thankful for the privilege of rising at five o'clock on a cold Thanksgiving morning to hear Mass and receive Holy Communion before the beginning of the day's grind, one is led to the unalterable conclusion that the tribute paid them by a certain army chaplain was no flight of rhetoric, but a simple statement of truth.

Fifty nurses and a little group of secretaries were gathered recently before the altar in a Knights of Columbus building at one of our mid-western camps. It was a Requiem Mass that was being celebrated for the nurses who had given up their lives that others might live. The simple music of the Mass was rendered by a choir of nurses, and before the altar lay an improvised bier upon which the flag of our country lay in loving folds and about which tapers burned. The congregation was made up of those who had known and walked daily with the beloved dead. There was even present one nurse who had lost her own sister in the plague. So soon as she had taken the body home and committed it to the earth

she returned and took up her duties once more in the familiar wards. It was all very simple, all very touching, all very unostentatious. But so, for that matter, is the Gospel, and so were the first Holy Masses in the catacombs of the Eternal City.

At the close of Mass the chaplain turned to the little company. The words that he uttered were few and direct. There was small need of polished diction or of fine flowing sentences. None knew better than he the history written in those grim wards during the awful weeks in late October and early November, and more, his hearers knew that he knew. But this he said, and it is as old as the everlasting hills, as perennially truthful as is the Church, the abode of holiness and truth: "Your lot is humble and hard and nerve-racking, but God, who is merciful, throws about you something of the Divine. To more than one poor boy, tossing in the fever of delirium, you come as a veritable angel of mercy. You have fought and won as truly as the soldier on the battlefield or in the trenches. Living, you live in honor. Dying, you gain the reward that comes to those who toil and who attain."

### COMMUNICATIONS

*Letters, as a rule, should not exceed six-hundred words.*

#### Catholic Publicity Again

*To the Editor of AMERICA:*

For the benefit of all who are interested in Catholic publicity, as well as myself, I would like to ask Mr. Michael Williams through your columns whether his able and eloquent articles on the subject have borne any fruit, produced any tangible results, or whether he can report progress at all. While personally I would hail the advent of a Catholic daily with delight, my policy always has been to adjust myself to actual conditions and take advantage of the opportunities open to us through the secular press. There are millions of dollars invested in secular papers to the \$1,000,000 proposed for a single Catholic daily. The man who does not own a limousine of his own can hire a taxi and reach his destination just as quickly as though he owned his own car, and much more cheaply. In fact, for all practical purposes, and for the time being, he owns the taxi. There are thousands of taxis—I mean secular papers—for hire, as was fully proven in the late frantic political campaign and the numerous war-drives, in which photos, posters, interviews, scare heads, full-page advertisements and all the other means known to the newspaper fraternity, were employed to promote the objects in view. Were one-tenth of the energy and money expended in these enterprises employed in the dissemination of Catholic truth, the whole country would soon be aroused and interested in the message the Church has for the world. Not to employ this means so ready at hand would be to imitate a pastor who would refuse to go on a sick call because he did not own a "flivver," and needs must wait till the congregation presents him with a car! Meantime, the patient dies. Now the whole world is sick, or rather, reviving from a frightful debauch brought on by its own imprudence, and is hungry for spiritual food and crying for a physician. We possess the exact kind of food required and have among us the Divine Physician, and yet refuse to make Him known till we can do so through the columns of our own Catholic daily! But think of the opportunity lost.

A priest, a bishop or a cardinal preaches the word of life to a congregation of perhaps 500 or 1,000 souls. The next day a big secular daily prints the sermon in full, or in part, and the message is brought to 500,000 or 1,000,000 famishing souls who could not have crowded into the four walls of the largest cathedral, even had they wished to do so! It is a modern miracle of the loaves and fishes. The beauty of it all is that the world is so hungry for spiritual knowledge, and the message we bear is so interesting, that many secular papers would gladly print it for

the asking, if indeed, they were unwilling to pay for it. But if not, could we not better afford to spend \$1,000,000 in 100 secular papers than in one Catholic daily? Sow the seed in this fallow field and it will soon take root and bear fruit in the form of one or many Catholic dailies. The writer read a column report of a sermon by a Seventh Day Adventist preacher sandwiched in between flaming political advertisements, on the eve of the recent election, in a big secular paper, and written in so fascinating a style that whoever read the first sentence could hardly stop till he read the last one, which announced that the subject would be continued at such a place and time "if the influenza condition permitted!" Verily, the children of this world "are wiser in their generation than the children of light." Let us hear from Mr. Williams again, telling what has been accomplished.

St. Paul.

WM. F. MARKOE.

#### Gild Idea Revived in New York

*To the Editor of AMERICA:*

On November 1 the New York Photo-Engravers' Union sent to their employers a scale of prices for the minimum charges for which engravings must be sold, adding that a disregard of these prices "will result in our requesting the withdrawal of our members from your employ." The workmen say that the purpose of this measure is to prevent the destructive competition which has prevailed in the trade, due to the fact that the employers did not know the costs, and fixed prices accordingly. They regulated prices so as to get business, and tried to get the workmen to make up losses. This scheme is a restoration of the old craft gild practice of a time when master and men worked in harmony and there was no such distinction as capital and labor. As it may solve troubles which are imminent in other trades, their experiment will be watched with interest.

Orange, N. J.

S. H. HORGAN.

#### Justice for Ireland

*To the Editor of AMERICA:*

The great world war is over, and the stage is set for the most important Peace Conference of recorded time. It is eminently fitting that, at this conference, where so many peoples will seek charters of their rights and liberties, this nation should be represented by the man who perhaps, better than any other, has voiced the cravings of peoples and nations for self-government. At this time when the fate of small nations hangs in the balance, and is about to be determined, what is the plain and obvious duty of the American people? Is it our part to remain indifferent, apathetic or quiescent while the fruits of victory are apportioned among the favored few, or is it ours to see and demand that the things for which our soldiers fought and died shall be guaranteed for all times and to all peoples in the articles of peace?

In this connection it is well to keep in mind our end and aim in entering the war, namely, "to make the world safe for democracy; to vindicate the rights of small peoples to self-determination." If these things are not secured by the peace pact, if any nation longing for and requesting the right of self-government shall be denied it, then indeed, will our soldiers have fought and died in vain. This country seems a fertile field for propaganda. The German propaganda has hardly run its course when English propagandists come upon the stage and shine in various colored lime-lights. We are told, for instance, that our school histories must be rewritten in order to do justice to England and the English. Incidentally one may remark, how about justice for Ireland?

Of course as between England and Ireland in appealing to America, Ireland is unfortunately handicapped. It seems she never declared wars or waged wars against the original thirteen colonies or against the United States, but then there are other ways of displaying sympathy and friendship. To those who



know history it is unnecessary to speak of what the United States owes Ireland. We have paid our debt to France in blood and treasure, let us square accounts with Ireland by pleading her cause before the nations at Versailles. The nation that was great and influential enough to turn the tide of war should also be able to exert its influence in shaping the terms of peace.

This is a matter so important that it should not be left to spasmodic gatherings or to small, and, for the most part, uninfluential organizations. It is a matter that touches our national honor; it should appeal to our national sense of gratitude and justice. From every pulpit, from every rostrum, by every newspaper, in these United States should go forth the demand that Ireland must and shall be free.

Does this nation owe anything to Ireland? If so, let her speak now in Ireland's cause or hold her peace forever. To speak now in no uncertain manner in Ireland's cause is to convince the world of our sincerity in the war and our loyalty to long-trying friends. To be silent now in Ireland's cause is to convict ourselves of insincerity in the war, as well as of disloyalty to our friends and our soldier dead.

Binghamton, N. Y.

J. F. L.

### The Teacher and Practical Life

To the Editor of AMERICA:

It is said of Suarez that after he had preached a sermon of some two hours, one of his pupils commented: "Father Suarez, you had better keep to teaching." This instance is one of many that some might bring forth to support the conviction that pedagogues are not practical men: their domain is bordered on all sides by theory. This, however, is hardly a general principle. Probably the three greatest men of the world-war are Wilson, Foch and Mercier. Nor is it an exaggeration, I think, to say that in the cause of the Allies, each has by his personality, practical genius and efforts, most eminently represented and furthered respectively statesmanship, military strategy, and morality. By the last I mean the moral justification, the sense of righteousness credited to the Allies' cause; and contrarily, the injustice imputed to the Germans. All three men, be it noted, are ex-professors of high merit. Obviously, the conclusion is, the teacher's role is not of itself an impediment to great achievements in the other so-called more practical vocations of life.

Woodstock, Md.

R. J. McWILLIAMS, S. J.

### The Carnegie Pension System

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In the December number of the *Atlantic Monthly*, in an article entitled: "The Pension Problem and its Solution," Mr. Henry S. Pritchett, the Director of the Carnegie Foundation, makes some candid admissions in regard to the failure of the Carnegie pension system for retiring professors. With only a superficial knowledge of the number of colleges and professors in this country, both he and his advisers could have foreseen that it was impossible to carry on the plan of pensions. The whole scheme from the outset was one of marked partiality. It claimed to help the whole body of American teachers, and yet it excluded "sectarian" institutions. Nevertheless in his recent article Mr. Pritchett still writes as if he were working for the entire teaching profession in this country and Canada.

And what of those who have accepted pensions? According to Mr. Pritchett the beneficiaries have been "demoralized"; they have been a part of a scheme that has "been a prolific breeder of human selfishness," the system appealed to human weakness, etc. If the plan has been such a failure and so degrading to humanity, we Catholic educators were fortunate in being omitted from the list of the Carnegie pension system.

Mr. Pritchett has now a new plan for helping superannuated teachers. He has opened an insurance office. But in estimating

the value of this new venture, we must not forget that the ultimate aims of the Carnegie Foundation have never been revealed. Perhaps the best analysis of the whole plan of this Foundation yet given to the public was the paper read before the Catholic Educational Association in Chicago, 1911, by that master of logic, the Rev. Timothy Brosnahan, S.J. His conclusions were:

We may now suggest a name for the corporation which will in a fuller measure indicate its purpose than that which "after much discussion and long seeking" was adopted by the trustees. If it had been designated "The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Non-Sectarian Teaching," it would have been described with more intellectual honesty. If it had been called "The Carnegie Foundation for the Secularization of Education," its purpose and ultimate aim would have been manifested.

The Carnegie Foundation in its aims and methods has not reflected great credit on those who conceived and managed it.

Cincinnati.

H. S.

### Spiritual Shams

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The *Atlantic Monthly* for November contains an article by Joseph H. Odell, entitled, "Spiritual Realities and High Explosives." It seems to me that "Spiritual Shams" would be more appropriate in the first part of that title. Speaking of the American soldiers singing "Joan of Arc" as they passed through her native village, Domrémy, he says: "Boys from the Middle West, from New York and New England, from the mountains of North and South Carolina . . . singing as they marched along the white road, a song that was an urgent prayer to the heroine-saint of France. Yet not one of them believed dogmatically in the invocation of the saints." The truth of the latter assertion may well be called into question. Was there not one Catholic among all these soldiers? Besides, I am quite sure that those who did not "believe dogmatically" had sufficient good sense not to boast of their misfortune.

I quote a passage: "There is an identity which is indigenous to the human spirit, a postulate neither theological nor ecclesiastical, reached neither by logic nor by experience. . . . To define it is more than difficult. . . . But it may be described as the instinct for establishing and retaining contact with the Supreme Being."

An excellent example of twentieth-century enlightenment in matters religious! Theology or church authority cannot account for it. Experience is unable to sound its mysterious depths. Logic, the science governing the right use of the rational powers, fails to discover the *raison d'être* of this "jellyfish religion." Why not try paralism? It is a very reliable open sesame to the causes of such paranoiac effusions.

The greatest consolation to be found in this hobblepoise religion is that under its influence "any man can establish contact with the Infinite without even the preliminary of bowed knees or closed eyes, and without an audible medium." So the Catholic Church has been teaching her children for nineteen centuries, in requiring them to meditate or pray mentally. But Mr. Odell scoffs at the idea of external worship, "creeds, and rituals, and politics-stupid!" The Church has also been teaching that vocal prayer, public and private, is necessary as well as mental prayer. External worship is a *rationabile obsequium*, too. Man is composed of body and soul, and is therefore bound to a twofold worship of God. Internal worship will not suffice. For, as the soul is so dependent on the senses, especially since the commission of sin, it is necessary that our senses should concur in their manner to praise and glorify God. Finally, Mr. Odell's keen intellectual powers have penetrated the tenebrous maze by which we are surrounded and have discovered that "Catholicism seems to be an irrelevance and impertinence." Poor, misguided and misleading Catholic Church!

Philadelphia.

THOMAS J. BURKE.

# A M E R I C A

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1918

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.  
President, RICHARD H. TIERNNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;  
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:  
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00  
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

Address:  
THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.  
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW  
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

*AMERICA will have a special correspondent at the Peace Conference, in the person of Mr. J. C. Walsh, late editor of the "Montreal Star."*

## The Convict Preaches a Sermon

YOU see these rather grisly processions from time to time in Grand Central Station: a sheriff or two, a few policemen, perhaps, in the van and rear guard, and the reason for it all, half-a-dozen prisoners, *en route* for Sing Sing. For the law must be fulfilled and justice satisfied. Pressing close to such a company some weeks ago, a poorly dressed old woman pushed through the crowd to put something into the hand of a swaggering young criminal. A sheriff interposed, and capturing the envelope, opened it. Within was a line scrawled on a piece of yellow paper, "Now try to be a good boy, Johnny," and two crumpled one dollar bills. Johnny took the money eagerly enough, but what he said about his mother's advice cannot be repeated here. Briefly, it was to this effect, that as he would be withdrawn from the busy haunts of men for the next twenty years, his chances of revisiting his old fields might be safely considered small.

But as the train pulled away, he mellowed. "Strange," he reflected, "how a feller never gets wise until it's too late. He always thinks he can get away with it. If I had to begin all over again, I'd do what my mother told me." The young gentleman philosophized wisely, if too late. He differs, perhaps, from many of us in this only, that the law has caught up with him. For all of us are under the law. Education and environment keep us far from vulgar infractions of the criminal law, but of the law of God we are not so careful. For "mother" in the convict's conclusions, substitute "the authority of God," and most of us can make a salutary examination of conscience. It will teach us the folly of thinking that we can forever trifle with God's law in small things or in great, and, in the language of the day, "get away with it." God is infinitely patient, but our day is short, for soon the night falleth. Will it find us in a plight that has no odor of salvation about it? Our little Saviour

has come, with His gift of peace and healing, but we must be ready to receive it. It is given to weak men, to sinful men, to struggling men, but only if they are men of good-will. "Begin all over again" before it is too late.

## Intelligent Land-Reclamation

IN President Wilson's message to Congress considerable attention was given to the project of land-reclamation, as offering one of the most desirable methods of securing employment for our returning soldiers. Nowhere, perhaps, has this problem been approached more intelligently than in the recent California experiment, the full details of which are presented in the December number of the *Engineering News-Record*. They deserve to receive nation-wide attention.

The reclamation of land is costly and often entirely unsatisfactory. It supposes, moreover, a considerable capital or the loan of money at prohibitive rates of interest. No less than twelve per cent is frequently demanded on short-time loans, when these can be secured at all by the farmer. In the Durham tract, the first to be reclaimed, a soil-map was drawn up by experts who determined the kind of agriculture best suited to each section. All preliminary sanitary requirements were fulfilled and drainage and irrigation schemes carefully prepared by competent engineers. The entire work was accomplished through agencies already created and paid for by the State and Federal Government. Thus each farmer might be given the full benefit of the cumulative knowledge and experience of the best public experts and the cost was reduced to a minimum.

The financial question is obviously the most difficult problem that confronts a prospective buyer. The prices of farm units were consequently made to vary from \$3,600 to \$13,600, and the terms of purchase were five per cent down and five per cent each year on the principal until paid, with five per cent interest on the unpaid balance. This is an enlightened solution of this preplexing difficulty. To ease the higher interest of the earlier years the payment on the principal was proportionately scaled down for that period. Equally reasonable were the arrangements made for the payment of improvements, while the farm-labor problem received a new solution. The laborers were furnished their own plots of approximately two acres each where they and their families might be encouraged to stay. Such allotments sold for \$400 each. The first tract to be opened consisted of sixty-three farms and twenty-one farm-laborers' allotments. Loans were given for the building of a home and each settler might confer with the department of farmstead engineering regarding his choice of a design.

The genuinely Catholic spirit of these arrangements is obvious. The old gild spirit, too, manifests itself in the co-operation introduced among the farmers themselves. All who would raise stock must first become members of the co-operative stock-breeders' association.



Thus an exclusively pure breed is secured, while certain heads of cattle are co-operatively owned for this purpose. The success of these methods has already led to the extension of the co-operative idea to the purchase for the community of various seeds and farm materials. Even the old-time town meeting is held, at which common agreements are made and a fine community spirit generated.

As in the medieval gilds, each applicant's record is carefully studied. The insidious dangers of capitalism, too, are so far as possible guarded against. The settler may not be the holder of agricultural lands elsewhere to the value of \$15,000, nor may his other holdings, together with present purchases, exceed that sum. He is further pledged: "To reside on the farm for at least eight months in each calendar year, for at least ten years from the date of approval of his application, unless prevented by illness, or unless he presents some other reason satisfactory to the board." The entire plan appears to be an enlightened form of State assistance. It provides for the economic independence of the individual farmer, for co-operative efficiency and for a highly useful form of service that will redound to the welfare and prosperity of the entire country.

#### What Isaiah Suggests

**W**HAT shall the New Year's resolutions be this time? Perhaps the old ones are still quite serviceable and need but to be taken down from the shelf where they have been resting undisturbed since last February or March. With a little furbishing no doubt they can be made as good as new. For last year most of our readers probably determined to take practical means to become prayerful, kind, cheerful and busy during the coming twelve months, and the happiness and peace they enjoyed through the year now closing can be quite accurately gaged, they will own, by the measure of their success in keeping those resolutions. Wisely determining to re-resolve once more along similar lines, let those who are thus facing courageously the year 1919, turn to the Prophet Isaiah in search of fresh grounds for steadfastness and confidence and they will not be disappointed. He calls out, for example, from his fifty-eighth chapter:

Deal thy bread to the hungry, and bring the needy and harborless into thy house: when thou shalt see one naked, cover him, and despise not thy own flesh. Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thy health shall speedily arise, and thy justice shall go before thy face, and the glory of the Lord shall gather thee up. Then shalt thou call, and the Lord shall hear: thou shalt cry and He shall say, Here I am. If thou wilt take away the chain out of the midst of thee, and cease to stretch out the finger, and to speak that which profiteth not; when thou shalt pour out thy soul to the hungry, and shalt satisfy the afflicted soul, then shall thy light rise up in darkness, and thy darkness shall be as the noonday. And the Lord will give thee rest continually, and will fill thy soul with brightness, and deliver thy bones, and thou shalt be like a watered garden, and like a fountain of water whose waters shall not fail. And the places

that have been desolate for ages shall be built in thee: thou shalt raise up the foundations of generation and generation: and thou shalt be called the repairer of the fences, turning the paths into rest.

In this striking passage is enjoined the practice of virtues that will do much to make the year 1919 a serene and prosperous one. For the many deeds of charity we do for those in need will render our prayers so strong that abundant grace will be given us to avoid unkind and unprofitable words; from fervent prayer, too, will come the gift of being to others a source of joy and comfort, and persistent prayer will likewise win the virtue of cheerful diligence which so wonderfully strengthens and beautifies the character. It would be wise, therefore, to let the Prophet Isaiah suggest some of our New Year's resolutions.

#### The Responsibility of Corporations

**S**OME months ago, in a New York street railway accident, ninety passengers were instantly killed, and more than 200 were seriously injured. Since that time, a magistrate's court has been sitting, with the praiseworthy desire of fixing the blame. As a result, the president and three other officials of the company have been held in bonds of \$10,000, following indictment by the Grand Jury on a charge of manslaughter. It is now said that the accused men will exercise their undoubted right of seeking a change of venue, alleging that the hostility of the public in the neighborhood in which they have been operating their lines is such as to preclude the possibility of a fair trial.

On the grounds both of common justice and the common welfare, these men should freely and willingly be accorded every chance allowed by law to present their defense. The issues at stake are far too important to be entrusted either to a prosecuting attorney intent on gaining his case, wherever justice may lie, or to a set of corporation attorneys bent on vindicating the action of their clients, with no reference whatever to the public good. An excellent beginning has been made; some steps, at least, have been taken to secure the solution of a few modern problems to which ethics gives a clear, and the law, a muddled answer. Is the whole duty of a board of directors towards the stockholders and friendly banks? May they properly interest themselves solely in the financial returns of their company? Are they to share only the profits and none of the hazards? May a man whose knowledge of railroading was acquired when he pulled a train at the end of a string around the nursery assume the direction of a railroad company? Or must his knowledge be such as to enable him to foresee danger to the public, and immediately correct the faults of his subordinates which, unchecked, will imperil the lives of his passengers?

Ethics and common-sense have spoken. What is now much needed is a plain answer in law. A fair trial devoid both of State browbeating and capitalistic petti-

fogging may give that answer. If a corporation in charge of a public utility has no other duty to the public than to make the public pay, it is important that the public should know this important fact, and prepare to change it. If some further duty to the public does exist, that equally important fact should be brought home to the corporation. As matters now stand, the worst any company has to fear after any catastrophe is a damage suit, or, possibly, a fine. Neither is an answer to the question at issue. If public utility corporations are not at fault, they should not be mulcted of their hard-earned money. If they are at fault, the payment of money is only an extra-legal form of license to keep on sinning. And for that license some companies will gladly pay.

#### Our Proposed Prussian Schools

A FORMER Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States has asked whether in this war for freedom, we have not lost our free republic. Mr. Hughes was not ignorantly carping at any supposed wartime "usurpation of power" by the President. Whatever may be said of some of the Chief Executive's subordinates, in no point whatever has Mr. Wilson's policy embraced "usurpation." The framers of the Constitution, a document often referred to, occasionally consulted, and sometimes studied, wisely provided for a great shifting of authority to the President in time of war, and as a matter of fact, there are vast powers at his command, which the President has never thought of invoking.

What the former Justice rightly criticised, was the tendency of government officials to retain and vigorously exercise in time of peace, powers granted solely for the emergency of war. It would be folly to deny that this baneful tendency is now exceedingly strong. Worse, it has thrown its force to movements initiated long before the war began. This is particularly true of the Smith bill which, in effect, proposes to transfer by degrees the supervision of the local schools from the local authorities to officials at Washington; or, in other words, to "federalize" them. Strangely enough, this measure has not only not been opposed by many whose whole temper is strongly against any further Federal encroachment upon our already attenuated local governments, but has received their unqualified support. "Camouflage" is of doubtful value even in the enemy's country, but it has no place at all among friends. The stories of illiteracy in many States, particularly in the South, now circulated in defense of the bill, are worthy the most lacrimose of our journalistic "sob sisters," and very probably have the additional merit of being true. But there are wrong ways of doing the right thing. Shall we do the right thing by setting up a Federal Department of Education, heavily subsidized by an annual hundred-million dollar appropriation?

If we incline to an affirmative answer, we ought to know that this Bureau has power to marshal an army

of office-holders at Washington and throughout the country, thereby throwing the schools into the unclean arena of partisan politics. He is a simple citizen who believes that the political adage "to the victors belong the spoils" is forgotten wisdom. Furthermore the agents of the Bureau are authorized to inspect, investigate, fix school-programs, educate teachers, and by appropriations of money, build up all such schools as will bow the knee to this governmental Baal, and incidentally, put God completely out of the classroom. A Government that can prescribe the training of teachers, as well as the studies to be followed by American children, is a Government at whose feet ancient Prussia might have humbly sat to beg further instruction in the now completely discredited art of making all children wards of the State, and all citizens mere puppets in the hateful game of selfish statecraft. We may now be ready for many new things in this country, but we are not ready for the importation of this poison of Prussianism.

Finally, we Catholic citizens may as well face the fact, of which our Lutheran brethren seem keenly aware, that the passage of the Smith bill means the gradual but certain extinction of the private school. It now costs Catholics a great sum to secure for their children schools in which God is neither politely ignored nor summarily shown the door, but if the Smith bill ever becomes a Federal statute, the parochial school, humanly speaking, will be an impossibility. How do we intend to meet this new peril to religion and society? If we are content to sit down and wait to see what will happen, our gloomiest pessimists will be justified. Possibly you are unable to stir the society of which you are an honored member, to a collective protest, but you can at least pen a personal protest to your local Congressman and both your Senators. Tell them that you are one of many American citizens who think this an ill time to restrict still further the right of the community over its schools, and a very ill time, indeed, to force upon the country a degree of Prussianism to which even the most ardent disciples of Kultur did not attain.

#### A New Argument for Government Ownership

PERHAPS the people of this country favor Government ownership of things in general, and yet it may be that they do not. In either case, they will not be helped to a clearer understanding of the factors to be considered, by the statement recently issued by the Postmaster General. Mr. Burleson now openly advocates government ownership of the telegraph and telephone lines, and assuming that the Government can serve the public better than the private companies, announces that the lines can be taken over without cost to the people. What has been thought a complicated problem is, to his intellect, as simple as the multiplication table. For the lines now earn eight per cent yearly; therefore let the Government borrow money at four and one-half per cent, pay off the debt with the annual profit, and at the



end of a quarter-century or so, you will find that you have made a splendid investment.

All this sounds too good to be true; and it is. It is denied that the telegraph and telephone companies have consistently paid the profit ascribed them by the sanguine Mr. Burleson, but even if they did, the fact furnishes no guarantee whatever that the Government could do the same. Except by the aid of book-keeping jugglery, the Government has never made the Post Office pay its own expenses. Within the memory of man, it took over the railroads, calmly disregarded the Federal statutes binding the corporations, increased the freight and passenger tariff, and at present is conducting the roads at a loss. Just why Mr. Burleson thinks the Government can succeed with the wires when it failed with the rails, is something that the public has not been permitted to know.

Nor is there any pressing reason to believe that the Government could borrow money at a low rate, for the purpose of taking over the lines. Under the stimulus of war and the realization that the very existence of the country was at stake, it sold Liberty Bonds at four and one-fourth per cent. But fervent appeals to patriotism

and honest emotion seem slightly out of place, when the proceeds are to be invested in a commercial enterprise. Thousands of Americans gladly sacrificed much to save the country, but it is not probable that many care to deprive themselves of necessities and decent comforts to set up the Government in business. To borrow money at four and one-half per cent in order to engage in an enterprise paying eight per cent, may not be the easy task that Mr. Burleson thinks it. The New York *Tribune* is not always an unprejudiced witness when this official is concerned, but the following paragraph points out a fatal defect in Mr. Burleson's project:

The Government's record with properties and its general reputation in business are such that no investor would put a dollar in it, except that it had behind it the power to make good its deficits by taxation. Even then it is the slowest pay and the worst debtor in the world.

With other sore needs at hand, it does not seem probable that a four and one-half per cent bond issue for the purchase of the telegraph and telephone lines, would be a successful venture. And if Mr. Burleson cannot get his loan at that rate from the people at large, what hope is there that he can get it in the open market?

## Literature

### EDMOND ROSTAND

SUCCESS adopted the late Edmond Rostand and treated him like a petted child. From his first appearance as a playwright, he could exclaim: *Veni, vidi, vici*. He came, set Rudel, Cyrano and Flambeau about their adventures, and had Paris at his feet. He had dramatic gifts of an uncommon order. He squandered them for a few short years in *La Princesse Lointaine*, in *Cyrano de Bergerac*, in *L'Aiglon*, in *Chantecler*. Then came an eclipse, partial, it was hoped at first, but which unfortunately proved to be complete and final. The gifted poet had done great work. He did not carry to its natural crest the task which from the beginning he seemed destined to accomplish. He leaves a brilliant name. The *Cyrano* and *L'Aiglon*, and certain passages of the *Chantecler* will keep his memory in the heart of the coming generation but in spite of its undeniable powers his work must remain fragmentary and incomplete.

Edmond Rostand chose the theater as his profession. Through him, but in his own way, the traditions of Racine, Corneille, Molière, Victor Hugo would be continued. It was an ambitious and daring attempt. But nature had largely qualified him for the work. He came from the South where poetry runs in the veins of its children as warm as the ruddy nectar in the vines clustered on the hills of Albi or under the walls of Carcassonne. A ray of the Provençal sun had been locked up in his heart. The rhythm of the songs of the troubadours still clinging around Arles and Toulouse, had strayed down to the wharves of Marseilles and had awakened responsive chords in his soul. At the College Stanislas, one of the old ecclesiastical schools, where he had as his professor Mgr. Alfred Baudrillart, he learnt his mother-tongue with an intimate knowledge not surpassed by any writer of his day. That knowledge Rostand the dramatist abused. For the dramatist like the orator must confine himself to the language of the people in its broadest and homeliest uses. Molière mercilessly rubbed out from the *Misanthrope* and the *Avare* every word which an old

charwoman could not grasp. Rostand should have rubbed out a hundred. His language is at times that of the dilettante, that even of the specialist in Parisian *argot*. There are passages in *Chantecler* which few except habitués of the Paris cafés or salons can readily understand. At all times Edmond Rostand is a dazzling rhetorician. Much of his rhetoric is of the highest order. There are passages on the lips of Cyrano and Chantecler and Flambeau in *L'Aiglon*, which are better than mere rhetoric. They are battle-calls, bugle-blasts that stir the blood, they are deeds, actions, at times the real action which the drama puts before us.

There is much ad on the stage of Edmond Rostand. Movement, ceaseless, labyrinthine, weaves its mazes in and out of the throng of actors. In *Cyrano* there are gamblers, and Gascons and musketeers and pikemen, flower-girls and vendors of iced drinks; pastry-cooks, actors, actresses, monks, nuns, crooks, duelists, cardinals, priests, lackeys, marquises and counts. It is Paris and Mayfair, Vanity Fair and Coney Island, fan-play and sword-play together. The motley life of the days of Louis XIII eddies before us. It is as crowded, as tumultuous as a bit of sixteenth-century tapestry. But the movement is scattered, sometimes meaningless. It suits the movies rather than the dramatic stage. It is confined to the outer man and does not, as a rule, get beneath the upper layers of the soul, and it is the soul, after all, which must be laid bare in the drama. There is all the distance between genius and mere talent, in the stealthy gliding of Lady Macbeth from the couch whence remorse drives her in her sleep, noiselessly cleansing the stain from her little hand, and the frantic anger of *L'Aiglon* as under the taunts of Metternich he hurls the lamp against the pier-glass in which, doomed victim of his own weakness and his father's titanic greatness, he sees himself reflected, and realizes his moral and physical helplessness. This is a dramatic, perhaps better a theatrical moment. But in inner significance it is inferior to the mysterious soul-revelation evoked by Shakespeare.

In the externals of the drama Rostand has few peers. Life bubbles and sparkles in *Cyrano*. And on the whole it is honest, generous, even heroic. Faith has not yet gone out of the hearts of the people. Cyrano, in spite of a mocking spirit and a tongue as sharp as the rapier with which he can snip a button from a rival's doublet as easily as the pastry-cook-poet Ragueneau spits a capon for the roast, embodies much that is splendid in the hearts of the French people. Cyrano hates bullies, but he hates a bore and a pretentious fool still more. He can fight for the weak. The more numerous his enemies are, the more terribly he fights. He would have done wonders at the Marne and at Verdun had he lived to see these glorious days. He would have taken the American Marines of Belleau Wood to his heart. He knows how to do one thing which Frenchmen can do better perhaps than any other people in the world. He knows how to sacrifice himself for truth, justice and honor. He is boastful and a little theatrical. We readily pardon that in Frenchmen. They have some reasons to be a little vain: they have much to be proud of. Our hearts warm to Cyrano in his fight against himself, against all that he knows to be sham, coarse, unmanly and unfair. Cyrano in his inner spirit, is France, with her chivalry, France, which like the Roman Consul in the hour of danger can be the nobly reckless spend-thrift of her soul.

Is not France the protagonist also in *L'Aiglon*, in *Chantecler*? In the former we forget the sorrows, the helplessness, the brooding melancholy of another Hamlet come to life in the person of the son of the great Napoleon, the "Eaglet" doomed to wound his wings and beat out his life against the gilded bars of his Austrian cage. But with Flambeau and his jaunty Gallo-Celtic dare-deviltry and chivalrous loyalty, his quips and his soldier-slang, we live over the Napoleonic epic with Marengo and Wagram, all the titanic glories and glooms of the Great Emperor. The heart of old France, the heart of its modern poilus, beats in every line of the play. There are great things in its six acts. How winsomely the young Napoleon coaxes an empire from his grandfather, the good Emperor Franz! How fendish the work of Metternich as he destroys the splendid vision with a sneer! What tenderness in the heart of the dying Eaglet, as he lays his palsied hands on the head of poor Marie Louise, his frivolous but doting mother. And Flambeau's watch over the sleep of the "Little Corporal's" son; the childish, but epic bravado of the old sergeant mounting guard in his smuggled French uniform, in Schönbrunn Castle, in Vienna over his Emperor. Then Metternich's unexpected midnight visit, and Flambeau's ringing challenge backed by Flambeau's bayonet at the wily old diplomat's chest! These and a dozen other splendid scenes are the creations of a master. And Gilbert K. Chesterton judiciously says of the entire play that although the hero is a weakling, the subject "a fiasco," the end a premature death and a "personal disillusionment," "yet in spite of his theme . . . the unquestionable paean of the praise of things, the ungovernable gaiety of the poet's song swells so high that at the end it seems to drown all the weak voices of the characters in one crashing chorus of great things and great men."

If as in the *Aiglon*, as in the other plays Rostand displays in the words of Henry James "a merciless virtuosity of expression," if the action does not "get on," entangled as it is in the skein of the author's fancy and the intricacies of his verbal structure, everywhere there is the striving of the idealist after a great dream. In *Chantecler* the poet resorted to ornithology to produce new and startling effects. Aristophanes had tried something like it in "The Birds." The modern failed where the Greek succeeded. *Chantecler* was long expected, and loudly heralded. The *cocorico* of the Gallic cockerel startled, and amused, but did not register a decided victory. The play was too obviously artificial. What it precisely meant has not

been thoroughly determined. It cannot be a mere presentation of the fate of the poet under the lash of criticism. It is not evident that it is a mere call to work and a defense of the common and the real things of life from which neither love nor ambition should lure us. *Chantecler* again, it would seem, is France, the champion of the injured and the oppressed, the knight among the nations that fights for her ideals. *Chantecler* though Rostand did not realize it, is the embattled France which on the Marne saved civilization. And France is not entirely absent from the play where the knight D'Allamanon is untrue to his vows, but soon breaks the spell of evil and returns to the path of honor.

In *La Samaritaine*, though the author misinterprets the noble episode of the Samaritan woman and puts on the lips of Our Lord words which jar upon ears accustomed to His nobly simple yet Divine words, Rostand tried, we believe, to express his faith in the Redeemer of the world. But he was unfitted for such a subject. He lacked the spiritual and the supernatural note. His mind and his trend of thought were essentially theatrical.

In external action, movement, lyric power, dialogue crisp and crackling, retort with bite and sting, fancy, hyperbole, color, Elizabethan exuberance of language, wit and humor, dazzling spectacle, he was unexcelled in his day. For him the fountains of the great deeps of emotion, thought, pathos and tears were sealed. But a rippling cascade sparkles and twinkles in his work, broadening at times into the sun-kissed river and the threatening mountain tarn, while clouds gather and the thunder mutters. Quickly then the stream runs on, aimlessly and petulantly at times, but ever attracting notice and often arousing wonder and emotion.

J. C. R.

#### A GALAHAD OF FRANCE

To Captain Guynemer, Slain in Battle, September 11, 1917

Not in chain mail, nor armed with lance and sword,  
Rode he in quest of deeds of high emprise,  
But ere the dawn-flush bloomed, with humble guise  
In some wrecked chapel kneeling, he adored  
The Holy Grail upon the festal Board;  
Then, strong at heart, with courage in his eyes,  
He spurred his white-winged charger of the skies  
And joyous rode to battle for his Lord.  
Unconquered in a hundred frays, this pale  
Weak lad soared ever, till one wondrous day  
In the far skies he saw the rose-hued Grail,  
And St. Jeanne calling him; the mortal clay  
Fell charred to earth; his deathless spirit, free,  
Leaped upward to the Throne of Purity.

SIDNEY J. SMITH, S.J.

#### REVIEWS

**A Writer's Recollections.** By MRS. HUMPHRY WARD. Illustrated. Two Volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. \$5.00.

This well-written work combines a clever novelist's recollections of the notables she knew with a very opinionated modernist's appraisals of nineteenth-century churchman. The author is the eldest child of Thomas Arnold, the second son of Dr. Arnold of Rugby, being born in Van Dieman's Land in 1851, but coming when a small child to England where she was brought up. Though her father when at Oxford successfully resisted Newman's influence, "on the other side of the world" he "surrendered" to it, being received into the Church at Hobart, Tasmania, in 1854. Mrs. Ward's mother however was a violent Protestant of French Huguenot ancestry, and her father seems to have made no attempt to rear his little daughter a Catholic. The Arnolds in England took her in hand and she fell under the influence of "liberals" like her "Uncle Matt," Mark Patti-



son, Dean Stanley and Benjamin Jowett, and was accustomed as a girl to hear Christianity cleverly attacked, so it is small wonder, perhaps, that she turned out a "Modernist" and the author of such a book as "Robert Elsmere." In 1865 Mrs. Ward's father renounced Catholicism but eleven years later came back to the Church for good. His vacillations, no doubt, supplied his gifted daughter with ammunition when she subsequently wrote "Helbeck of Bannisdale" and "Eleanor." While engaged in the composition of the former novel, the author remarks that she "was seized with misgivings lest certain passages" presenting "the intellectual case against Catholicism should wound or distress" her father, so she "softened" them somewhat.

Readers of these "Recollections" will not be surprised to find in them highly colored portraits of such "advanced" or agnostic acquaintances of hers as Jowett, Green, Acton, Renan, Morley, Stanley, Tyrrell and Goldwin Smith, and of course every Modernist the author mentions is praised to the skies. Poor Newman she kindly patronizes. Owing to his defective education, it seems that he "had no critical sense of evidence." The reader is led to infer, moreover, that the Christianity of Pusey, Gladstone and Liddon would have become, no doubt, quite "rational" had they only read the German higher critics. If the Modernists of today instead of "deserting the churches" "would have the courage to claim them," Mrs. Ward could face the future with more confidence. Certainly the war has taught her very little, if she thinks a merely human Christ can save the world. Much pleasanter reading than the author's Modernistic propaganda are her personal and literary reminiscences, for she knew well many distinguished writers of the late nineteenth century, such as Henry James and Andrew Lang. The work suffers from the lack of an index.

W. D.

**The Advance of English Poetry in the Twentieth Century.** By WILLIAM LYON PHELPS. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. \$1.50.

The Lampson Professor of English Literature at Yale has done a service to lovers of poetry in his newest book, for he has brought together the names and poems of the poets who are capturing the ears of the world. That such an array of poets and poetry represents "an advance in English poetry" may be doubted, indubitably though it adds to the professor's repute for abundant knowledge. The list of poets will, of course, not satisfy, perhaps the professor was the last to suppose it would. Literally, one misses Alice Meynell, Theodore Maynard, Helen Parry Eden, Katharine Tynan, Madisson Cawein, Thomas Walsh, Padraic Pearse, from the list. If it be objected that Pearse and Cawein are dead, so are Henley, Thompson, Singe and Moody dead, and they receive a rather generous treatment from the author. Mr. Phelps seems to criticize only such poets as have books to their credit, yet Condé Pallen, Joseph Plunkett, and Clinton Scollard have published, and where are they? But a sin of omission in such a task as Mr. Phelps set himself, is easily pardonable. Love for our country will make us glad that there are so many Americans mentioned with favor in the book, and all Catholics will be glad in addition that the author calls Francis Thompson's "In No Strange Land" "one of the great poems of the twentieth century."

Native Irishmen, surely, and others, perhaps, will challenge the worth of such a statement as "the 'typical,' logicless, inconsequential Irish mind, so winsome and so exasperating, is not the kind of brain to produce permanent poetry"; conservatives in poetry will be pained because polyphonic prose is mentioned in a book on the "advance" of English poetry; and others may object because Vachel Lindsay claims about twenty pages of attention, while Joyce Kilmer is treated of in eight lines of an appendix. There is too much mere biography in the book, and not enough philosophizing upon the poet's view of life it-

self. Verse has been prolific these days, and Professor Phelps has drunk oceans of it. For instance, in an intoxicated moment, he quotes the following from one of the living poets than whom, according to the author, no one has contributed more to the advance of English poetry in the twentieth century:

Fat black bucks in a wine-barrel room,  
Barrel-house kings, with feet unstable,  
Sagged and reeled and pounded on the table,  
Pounded on the table,  
Beat an empty barrel with the handle of a broom,  
Hard as they were able,  
Boom, Boom, Boom.

At such an advance in English poetry Wordsworth need not tremble, and Shelley's laurels are secure. If "advance" in the title means the "course" of English poetry in the twentieth century, it would seem a slackening course that the poets are now running.

C. L. B.

**Armchair Philosophy.** By DANIEL A. LORD, S.J. New York: The America Press. \$0.80.

To the thousands of readers who eagerly followed last year the series of clever papers Mr. Lord contributed to AMERICA, this neat little book will come like an old friend. Basing his arguments on the sound, workable principles of scholastic philosophy, the author, first subjects to a ruthless examination the chief intellectual and moral vagaries of today and then clearly lays down the Catholic doctrine on the questions discussed. Those who read works on scholastic philosophy written in English often complain of the dry, unattractive way the matter is presented. Mr. Lord seems to have had such persons in mind, for the style of his book is agreeably familiar and by the frequent use of striking illustrations, apt examples and modern instances, presented with the literary skill of an experienced writer, he makes the age-old truths of Catholic philosophy intelligible even to that surface-skimming product of our times, the "general reader." Under such titles as "Intellectual Hara-kari," "The Pilot of the Soul," "Dynamiting the Moral World," "Moral Immorality," "A Cure for Caprice," "The Final Goal," and a dozen other chapter heads, the author discusses from the Catholic philosopher's viewpoint, the perplexing ethical and intellectual problems that every thoughtful man must face nowadays and offers him the Church's rational and satisfactory solution of them. "Armchair Philosophy" is a book that makes its readers its friends.

W. D.

**German Submarine Warfare: A Study of Its Methods and Spirit, Including the Crime of the "Lusitania," a Record of Observations and Evidence.** By WESLEY FROST, United States Consul, Formerly Stationed at Queenstown. With an Introduction by FRANK LYON POLK, Counselor for the Department of State. Illustrated. D. Appleton & Co. \$1.50.

**America in France.** By MAJOR FREDERICK PALMER. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. \$1.75.

If all who are to sit at the Peace Conference were to read Mr. Frost's book it is likely that the submarine would be declared an illegal weapon in future wars. The Germans' use of the undersea boat, as described by Mr. Frost, shows that in the hands of merciless and unscrupulous men, it increased to an almost unimaginable intensity the horrors of the conflict that has now ended. The author was in an excellent position to judge of the havoc wrought by the German submarine, for during much of the war he held the post of American Consul at Queenstown, the Irish port into which most of the surviving U-boat victims were brought. There he officially took down the testimony of all the Americans who lived to tell how the Germans behaved before, during and after the attacks they made and the very readable summary of it in this book is without question a dreadful indictment of the German war party. Mr. Frost arranges the testimony under five heads: (1) The manner of attack on unarmed

ships of the poorer class, (2) on freight ships of fair size, presumed to be armed, (3) on ships presumed to carry passengers, (4) on the manner survivors were treated while still on the scene of the attack, and (5) the way survivors were left to the mercy of the elements, far away from land. He estimates that "more than 18,000 innocent non-combatant men and women and children are now rotting beneath the sea from these shark forays" of the German U-boats. The author spares his readers few of the horrors of the scenes he describes and his account of the Lusitania crime is of set purpose one of graphic gruesomeness.

Major Palmer's new book is an experienced war correspondent's story of how the American Expeditionary Force steadily grew in numbers and efficiency from the day that General Pershing and his staff took two private houses in Paris a year ago last spring, until the successful attack made by the eight American divisions between the Meuse and the Argonne Forest last September. The volume records an achievement of which every American will always be proud. As the author well remarks:

The project for supplying the army let alone preparing it for battle, was an *enterprise surpassing that of the Panama Canal* in magnitude and difficulty. How we ever accomplished it is a wonder that can be explained only by our energy, our spirit and our team play under a driving and understanding leadership, inspired by the cause.

Ours is the glory of having been the decisive factor that brought to a righteous and victorious end the greatest war in history.

W. D.

#### BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Many of those who read in AMERICA last spring the admirable series of papers by the Rev. Dr. Edwin V. O'Hara of the Catholic University on the grave industrial problems that would face the country at the end of the war have doubtless felt a desire to see the four articles published in a more convenient form. Their wish has been realized, for in a recent pamphlet called "War, Peace and Labor" (America Press, \$0.10 a copy, \$7.00 a hundred), the author discusses "The Basis of Durable Industrial Peace," "Security against the Workman's Hazards," "Economic Freedom and Industrial Democracy" and "Faith and Industrial Peace," giving the only satisfactory solution to these questions which is that the Catholic Church proposes. Those two other timely booklets the America Press publishes "The Pope's War Work" and "Ireland's Plea for Freedom" are being widely read, and a pamphlet containing Dr. John A. Ryan's papers on what the nature of a permanent peace should be which appeared recently in AMERICA will soon be out.

"Edgewater People" (Harper, \$1.35), is a collection of twelve short stories by Mrs. Mary E. Wilkins Freeman. No modern writer has Mrs. Freeman's keen insight into life as it drags its slow course in the New England rural township, and at her best she may not unjustly be compared with Hawthorne. "The Outside of the House" is probably the best of these stories, but none of them can be ranked with what Mrs. Freeman has hitherto done in her chosen field.—"An American Family" (Bobbs-Merrill, \$1.50), by Henry Kitchell Webster, is neither "the Great American novel" of the Sunday newspaper review, nor "the big novel" that its publishers claim to consider it. The general reader will probably find it crude and platitudinous, while its amateurish views on factory evils and the remedy, are as pretentious as they are empty.—"The Island of Intrigue" (McBride, \$1.50), is a clever story of adventure by Isabel Os-trander. The rapid action of the well-worked-out plot holds the reader's attention from the first chapter till the end of the book. The characters while not original are skilfully handled

and the thrilling escapes of the likable heroine, Maida Waring, from her captors who are holding her for a large ransom, make the story a very readable one.

"The Catholic Church in the Philippine Islands" (Mission Press, Techny, Ill., \$0.05) by a Missionary of the Society of the Divine Word, is a valuable brochure of thirty-two pages, giving all the information concerning the religious history of the Philippines and their present status that a Catholic should know. It shows the wonderful activity of the Catholic missionaries in these islands. We may profitably contrast the beneficence of the Church to the Philippine natives with the ruthlessness of the Puritans at home. The annual "Mission Calendar" in English and German (\$0.15 each) is issued from the same press, and offers its wonted missionary pictures and literature as a constant reminder of the great cause of the propagation of the Faith. The *Little Missionary* published by the Techny Fathers, to promote the missionary spirit among our Catholic boys and girls, at present has over 50,000 subscribers, while the *Christian Family* has within a short time raised its circulation to 90,000.

"What martyrs we are!" moaned Lady Basil don in "An Ideal Husband." "And," observed Mrs. Marchmont, "how well it becomes us." Which sentiment is reflected fully in Miss E. M. Delafield's new book, "The War Workers" (Knopf, \$1.50). It is a gentle satire on the woman who engages herself to live laborious days in the canteen, the supply-center and the like, for the notoriety that is thereby gained. Miss Vivian, of the Midland Supply Depot and with a hypertrophied sense of self-importance, succeeds in inspiring in her staff the proper idealisms until it becomes known, after his death, that she preferred being at her office to quietly attending the sick-bed of her paralytic father. Whereupon, there is a girlish revolution among the staff-members, and the story closes, not, however, before the slender thread of romance that attached itself to the charming "Gracie" Jones and her friend, Captain Trevellyan, had been secured to a common future.—"From Baseball to Boches" (Small, Maynard, \$1.35), by H. C. Wilkin, offers in sporting-page lingo a "dough-boy's" impressions of life in the ranks—especially of its brighter side. Except for a few flashes of real wit in a monotonous shower of slang, the author succumbs to that handicap self-imposed by some American humorists. They overstrain their genius to twist the dialect of the diamond into strange usages and give it currency in every phase of life. We hear that shops in France frequented by our soldiers display the sign, "English Is Spoken Here—American Is Understood." In the folly of books like this is seen the wisdom of such signs.

One of the most musical poems in "The Old Road to Paradise" (Holt, \$1.25), Miss Margaret Widdemer's recent volume, is called "The Dancers," and runs thus:

Ours was a quiet town, a still town, a sober town,  
Softly curled the yellow roads that slept in the sun,  
Staid came the day up and staid came the night down  
And staidly went we sleepwise when the day's work was done!

Oh, they came dancing down, the gay ones, the bonny ones,  
We had never seen the like, sweet and wild and glad,  
Down the long roads they came, fluting and dancing,  
Flowers in each lass's hair and plumes on each lad!

Sweet were their clinging hands, kind were their voices,  
"Dance with us, laugh with us, good grave flock," said they,  
"Swift we must go from you, time's long for toiling,  
Come and make joy with us the brief while we stay!"

Oh, then was a gay time, a wild time, a glad time,  
Hand in hand we danced with them beneath sun and moon,  
Flowers were for garlanding and greens were for dancing—  
This was the wisdom we learned of them too soon!



Swift went the day past, a glad day, a wild day,  
Swift went the night past, a night wild and glad,  
Down fell their arms from us, loosening, fleeting,  
Far down the roads they danced, wild lass and wild lad!

Far fled their dancing feet, far rang their laughter,  
Far gleamed their mocking eyes beneath the garlands gay,  
All too late we knew them then, the wild eyes, the elf-eyes,  
Wood-folk and faun-folk that danced our hearts away!

Ours is a still town, a sad town, a sober town,  
Still lie the dun roads all empty in the sun,  
Sad comes the day up and sad falls the night down,  
And sadly go we sleepwise when the day's watch is done!

## SOCIOLOGY

### A Gentle Critic

IN his latest communication to AMERICA, Mr. T. J. Neacy, General Manager and Secretary of the Filer and Stowell Co., engineers, machinists and founders, has the following delicate compliments to pay to one of the staff members, and incidentally to the "Jesuit Order" in general:

Rev. Joseph Husslein, S.J., had three papers in AMERICA, one each September 7, 28, and October 12, on the woman-labor problem. It is a fairly safe guess that these articles were inspired by an A. F. of L. clipping, quoted on p. 597, September 28, which he has kept stored away for many years. The clipping (on its face a fake) is not dated, though it would fit in anywhere between 1866 and 1876 in most any of the southern States during the period that the carpet-baggers were in the saddle. In those districts at that time wages varied from \$16 to \$20 per month, plus so much rations. Howbeit I have no recollections of seeing even colored women employed in foundries in the southern States; as to white women working side by side with men in foundries at the present time and performing tasks beyond their strength, there is absolutely no record of as much as a single instance anywhere in this country. I have more than fifty replies to enquiries along that line and all of them brand the accusation as a lie out of whole cloth. It is true that women to some extent have been so employed during the war in England, where they performed all the foundry work from pig-iron to the finished casting, but in the United States the extent of women's employment in foundries is to make small cores for steam-heating and plumbers' supplies where on an average it takes six parts together to weigh a pound. They are also employed to paste together parts of larger cores made by men. In either case the work represents no more actual labor, if as much, as preparing a batch of dough for a family baking.

This data the Reverend Editor could have had for the request—by which I am reminded that while the Jesuit Order has a world-wide reputation for thoroughness, it gained none of it in the discussion of matters industrial.

The last remark, as the reader may understand, is based upon the deplorable obstinacy the Jesuit Order has shown in defending in its full extent the Labor Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, not merely as a judicious Papal document, but as perhaps the most scientific contribution to social literature during the past century.

### THE A. F. OF L. CLIPPING

THAT a writer who has devoted a great portion of his life to the study of social questions should suddenly have been so profoundly impressed by a chance clipping, "stored away for many years" in his desk, as to be "inspired" by it to perpetrate three lengthy articles and inflict them upon the public, must appear rather ludicrous. That this clipping, moreover, was on its face "a fake," reflects not merely upon the intelligence of the writer, but seriously impugns the veracity of the editor of the A. F. of L. *News Letter*, who supplied this information to the entire labor press.

The faked clipping, adds Mr. Neacy, is not dated and "would fit anywhere between 1866 and 1876 in any of the southern States." There was no need of dating the passage in question, which was doubtless reproduced in countless labor journals at

various times, since the writer expressly indicated that it was issued by the American Federation of Labor as a summary of "a New York factory investigation some few years before the war." That famous investigation, as every student of social questions must know, was begun in 1911 and continued in 1912. The general sanitary investigation alone covered 3,176 industrial establishments, in which 189,335 wage earners were employed, and included forty-five cities of the State of New York. The occasion of the investigation, which should forever make its date memorable in industrial annals, was the fire that occurred in New York City on March 25, 1911, in the factory of the Triangle Waist Company, in which 145 employees, chiefly women and children, lost their lives. The shock created by this appalling disaster can be compared only with the more recent impression made by the sinking of the *Lusitania*.

The investigation itself was one of the most thorough that has ever been conducted. The names of its chairman, Robert F. Wagner, and of its vice-chairman, Alfred E. Smith, should be sufficient guarantee of this. Four enormous volumes of evidence, at the writer's side, would really seem sufficient substantiation for the short passage in the A. F. of L. *News Letter*, so obstreperously questioned by Mr. Neacy. It tells of the stories of "women working side by side with men in iron foundries, performing tasks far beyond their strength, and subject to sudden changes in temperature which result in many instances in fatal diseases." Here, therefore, is the entire passage under indictment. The observations in it are restricted to the New York investigation. There was consequently no need of troubling Mr. Neacy and his kind friends for additional information.

It should finally be added that the entire clipping did not convey to the writer a single new idea. It was merely found useful as an evidence for the reader of what had long before been the writer's own independent conclusion. Neither one such clipping, nor a score of such clippings would be likely to influence his judgment any further.

### FOUNDRY CONDITIONS IN 1912

AND now to come to the verification of the statements in question. This is doubly important in as far as the writer has reprinted these three articles, with additions, in his latest book, "The World Problem: Capital, Labor and the Church." Describing the "general conditions" of the foundries of New York State in their report which contains no less than 1,986 pages, the Factory Investigation Commission said at the time:

The sanitary conditions in the brass, iron and steel foundries of the State were found to be very poor. . . . Women were found employed in foundries in Syracuse and Buffalo. They work under exactly the same condition and with the same surroundings as the men. They are subjected to the fumes of gas and to the smoke. This work means severe manual labor, and altogether the occupation seems to be a most dangerous one for a woman in so far as her health is concerned.

A majority of these women seem to be of foreign birth, although there are some who are natives of this country. The wages received by them are small, between \$4.00 and \$8.00 a week, while men doing similar work receive about \$3.00 a day.

The Commission is of the opinion that the employment of women in work of this kind in foundries in the State should be prohibited. Their employment in that industry is not only a great injury to themselves, but it is a menace to posterity, and should not be tolerated by any civilized community. ("Preliminary Report of the Factory Investigation Commission," 1912, Vol. I, p. 107.)

The conditions here described are hardly the same as those under which a woman prepares "a batch of dough for a family baking."

### SOME FOUNDRY OWNERS TESTIFY

TO indicate the nature of the evidence given by some of the foundry owners themselves the following passage from the

final report may tend to dispel some of Mr. Neacy's optimism. The Commission says:

If it is impracticable, as some of the foundry owners have testified, to separate the room in which the women are employed from the core oven by a substantial partition, so as to prevent the core-gas from escaping into the room in which the women work, these owners should cease to employ women in work never intended for them. We have no sympathy for the foundry owner who appeared before us and said that so far as work in the core room was concerned, there should be no distinction as to sex.

In this enlightened age very few will be deceived by any such fallacy. Nature itself has made the distinction which the foundry owner has said should not be made. Instincts of chivalry and decency as well as concern for the preservation of the race, demand that we should not permit women to engage in work detrimental to their health, that overtaxes their strength, and impairs their vitality as wives and mothers. ("Report of the New York State Factory Investigation Commission," January 15, 1913, pp. 324, 325.)

The cores we are told are placed in the ovens by men; but "In some places they are carried to the ovens, from the place in which they are made, by the women." (*Ibid.*, pp. 322, 323.) The testimony of the foundry owners adds that women are employed on small cores.

#### AS MR. NEACY SEES IT

SPACE forbids the quotation of any of the detailed testimony of the sworn witnesses. The description of the conditions that existed in the foundries of New York State in 1912, as given in the "report," certainly do not tally with the following asserted by Mr. Neacy throughout the country today:

Foundries where women are employed are provided, as a rule, with rest rooms, adequately appointed, where privacy obtains for the changing from and to their street clothes. Under the Industrial Commission recommendations of the various States, factory hands are under the supervision of a matron, they report fifteen minutes later than the men in the same department and leave fifteen minutes earlier in the evening. They have a quarter of an hour's recess midway in the forenoon and afternoon and forty-five minutes for noon. Their total of hours per week is thus about forty-five hours and forty minutes.

In his own company, Mr. Neacy tells us, no women are employed outside the office, "because our product at all stages is a man's-size job." How far conditions have improved in the foundries of New York State since the investigation of 1912, it is not possible to indicate at present. An investigation into the employment of women in chemical industries in a certain section of the State revealed, according to George M. Price, M.D., "the same hazards in the plants as those disclosed in his report in 1912." (*The Survey*, December 24, 1918.)

#### THE FACT OF THE MATTER

IT is not the purpose of the writer to attack either capital or labor. Much less would he incriminate an entire class of men. The report of the New York Factory Investigation Committee makes sufficiently clear that any such attack would be entirely unjustified. The Commissioner himself of the National Association of Founders said:

I have been devoting considerable of my time in endeavoring to get foundry owners throughout the country to bring about better working conditions which go far beyond anything you have suggested in these measures [proposed by the Investigation Committee]. It is a business proposition, cutting out the philanthropy and all that sort of thing. ("Report," p. 837.)

It has ever been the contention of the writer, as clearly implied in "The World Problem," that there have been in the past three classes of employers: those who have left little to be desired in the provisions made for their workingmen; those who have honestly sought to attain to this same ideal, but have been prevented by the strain placed upon them by com-

petitors being unfair in their treatment of labor; and finally the men who have had no other ambition than the amassing of the largest possible fortune at any cost to the health and happiness of their employees. This statement, the writer trusts, will satisfy his gentle critic.

JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J.

## EDUCATION

### On Praise and Blame

"TO find fault is the only sure way of getting attention to the schools," wrote Professor Dewey in a recent number of the *Dial*. Fault-finding is usually regarded as an annoyance, yet, if it be met with the spirit of open-mindedness and zeal to improve, it may be made a very profitable thing. The trouble with fault-finding too often is that, instead of showing us our failings, it blinds us to them. But who is to blame for that? Is it the fault-finder, or ourselves?

#### CAN WE TAKE CRITICISM?

WELL, perhaps both. If the fault-finder chance to be a chronic "growler," we grow to resent his critical remarks. We begin to feel that he growls for the love of growling instead of for love of us. But perhaps if we had met his charges in the beginning with a little more frankness, a little more self-searching we would be better off today; and he might not be the perpetual "grouch" that he has become. We must keep cool. If we hear strictures passed on us, as individuals or as educators in-the-large, let us beware of flaring up and hurling a hot word back in response. Of such inflammable stuff unmendable quarrels are made. Let us rather hold our heads, make no retort if not the retort courteous, and, going our way, search ourselves "diligently," as the Bible tells us. There is plenty of time to answer, to dispute with facts and figures, if we can, the criticism we face; or to answer with the silence of self-improvement, which is the only answer worth while if we be indeed at fault.

There is some danger of our Catholic schools and our Catholic educators suffering from over-praise and self-esteem; from the spirit which resents criticism and will not hear of faults. Now of course we have in our midst the chronic fault-finder, who can see no good in the way our schools are managed; and him we abhor. He has in fact already brought his evil spell on us; so that, when we hear him speaking as Sir Oracle, we fire up and become blind even to those faults which our better sense tells us do exist in us, and which we should be working to remove instead of striving to hide or deny. But we will do well if, listening even to the chronic growler, we "search diligently" to find if there be any basis for his criticisms.

#### HAVE WE ANY FAULTS?

IT used to be said of a certain type of old-fashioned Irishman in America, that he was so filled with the idea of Irish perfection that even a race of archangels would hardly be comparable with the sons of Erin. It was a shrewd Irish Catholic editor who showed up that type; and when he did so he also very shrewdly put his finger on the source of the trouble. It was, said he, the annual St. Patrick's Day oration, that perfervid outpouring of poetic utterance which would almost convince even a British Tory that the real song of the starry spheres is "*Erin Go Bragh!*" Out of that brimming beaker of Celtic eloquence the soul-thirsty Irishman quaffed, each succeeding year, on the "Glorious Seventeenth," such copious draughts of self-assurance and glorification that for the full succeeding twelvemonth he went about convinced that he was simply the quintessence of impeccability who could commit no fault and was altogether beyond improvement. Therefore he did not improve!



That type of Irishman did more harm to himself and his compatriots than would fill a "Pink Book" of Hottentot atrocities. He invited criticism and fault-finding by very reason of his insufferable complacency. And, being inoculated, as he was, so violently with the virus of self-esteem, all he could or did do when he was criticised, was to fight back, blind to faults.

#### HOW TO PROGRESS

THERE is always an open season for school advertising, not alone for the advertisements that appear in print, but for the preaching and talking that go to spread abroad the virtues and advantages of whatever institution we are interested in. Our Catholic people are bound to hear a good deal said in pulpit and press about our schools; they have expounded to them, as rightly they should, the principles of Christian education; they hear the sound and unanswerable arguments that we advance in favor of it; and also they hear extolled the practical advantages of our Catholic schools. But, to the thinking man who is interested body and soul in the welfare and future of these same schools of ours, it occurs sometimes that they do not always hear what is good for them to hear. Some of the utterances they listen to on the subject of Catholic schools are too much like those St. Patrick's Day orations which our Irish editor analyzed. They are calculated to make Catholics a bit "cocky" and that is bad.

A priest of our acquaintance, who was a school inspector in a large diocese, once remarked that "If Catholic schools were in fact all that some of us declare them to be, you couldn't keep the Protestants away from them with a stick!" He was a man who knew something of the "inside" of things, and he had seen how we often make ourselves suffer through overpraise and complacency. He had head enough to see our faults as well as our virtues; and yet among the elect he was more than once frowned upon because he dared to suggest that this or that was not as it ought to be. He went bravely on finding fault, however, true to Professor Dewey's dictum that that is "the only sure way of getting attention." He got the attention, and the needed improvements, too.

#### A HELPFUL MIRROR

BUT if this trained and experienced priest found fault with the overpraise of which some of us are guilty in regard to our schools, what is to be said of those others who not only overpraise, but do so at the expense of other schools, which they blacken and damn as if they were veritable institutions of the devil? It is poor praise, assuredly, that is bought at the price of another's good name; yet, even in this day, that is the only sort of praise our Catholic schools get from some of our own Catholic people. Of course the man or woman who advertises a Catholic school in that fashion completely loses sight of the true situation.

Fault has been found, and still is, with our American educational system on the whole, for its many and obvious shortcomings; for its leaning toward faddism; for its lack of thoroughness; for its undeniable superficiality. And some kind words have been said even by non-Catholic educators in praise of Catholic schools for their avoidance in an appreciable degree of these selfsame faults. But Catholics who assume, on the strength of this, that their schools are faultless, that they possess a mortgage on all the educational virtues of the ages, that they are beyond criticism or cavil, should realize betimes that that way danger and failure lie. Let us rather welcome honest criticism, let us mend where we are mendable, and remember when we do hear criticism that it is one way at least, and a good way, too, of getting attention that can in time be made to pay dividends in progress and improvement.

CHARLES PHILLIPS.

#### NOTE AND COMMENT

##### Centenary of a Famous Hymn

HOW many who year by year thrill to the sweetness of that tender Christmas carol, "Silent Night! Holy Night!" know that it was written just 100 years ago? The *Epworth Herald* calls attention to this first centenary in the following paragraph:

This beautiful carol, sung by all Christendom, celebrates the one hundredth anniversary of its birth this year. It is one of the gifts of the Roman Catholic Church to the world, having been written by the Rev. Joseph Mohr, an Austrian priest of that Communion. At the age of twenty-three, the author was ordained to the priesthood, and three years afterward, in 1818, he wrote this hymn for the Christmas service in the church which he served as vicar.

It is not known who translated Father Mohr's remarkably poetic hymn into English. But will its Germano-Austrian origin bar it this year from the churches of our separated brethren? The *Epworth Herald* answers this question in the negative. "Out of the clangor of the time, its Christmas message still rings true."

##### Red Cross Home Service

TO relieve distress is the function of the Red Cross societies. But one great need has surpassed all others in its claims upon the Red Cross, the need of the families whose men went forth to fight for their country. Since the "Home Service" of the Red Cross was organized nearly 1,000,000 people, members of the families of soldiers and sailors, have brought their troubles and their problems to the Home Service workers. Its functions have naturally gone far beyond merely saving families from actual want. Thus many have been aided in securing their payments through the War Risk Insurance Bureau or in having their papers properly made out. They were freely given expert legal, medical and educational advice. Household problems, entrusted to the wisdom of mature and experienced women, have been satisfactorily solved, and families were accurately and fully informed of the legal rights granted by the Government for their protection. These things have made many a soldier's and sailor's home happier though no money was asked or needed. The force engaged in this service consisted of 10,000 committees and 50,000 workers. But money, too, has been given out generously wherever it was needed. It is now the hope of the Red Cross that when the Christmas roll call is over every American will be a member.

##### An Appreciation of Bishop Currier

AFTER giving a brief sketch of the life of Bishop Charles Warren Currier, whose death was editorially noticed in AMERICA, the *Bulletin* of the Pan-American Union gives the following appreciation of his exceptional acquirements and distinguished labors:

His thorough acquaintance with languages both ancient and modern, as well as his general humanistic education and travels through different parts of the Western Hemisphere, assisted him materially in the study of Spanish literature and the natives of America, in both of which he became a noted scholar, being recognized as one of the most distinguished Americans and one of the most learned Hispanists of the United States. He attended and presented important subjects at the International Congress of Americanists held in various years at Palos de Moguer, Stuttgart, Buenos Aires, London, and Washington. He commenced a work on the "History of Spanish Literature," publishing several chapters of it, and wrote a number of criticisms of the work of Spanish and Spanish-American writers and poets. He was one of the most enthusiastic promoters of Pan-Americanism, contributing consistently to the better understanding between

the countries of the Americas, to this end furthering the establishment of the Spanish-American Athenaeum at Washington, of which he was director.

He is spoken of as "one of the most erudite and indefatigable" of the collaborators on the *Bulletin*. Among his voluminous writings the following are especially recalled to our attention: "Carmel in America," "Dimitrios and Irene," "The Rose of Alhambra," "History of Religious Orders," "Church and Saints" and "The Conquest of Granada."

#### A Catholic Editor's Proudest Day

**T**ESTIMONIES from the Cardinal Archbishop of Reims and the Cardinal Archbishop of Pisa, congratulating the *Western Catholic* of Quincy, Ill., for its staunch defense of the Holy Father against the accusations of pro-Germanism, are among the prized treasures of its editor, the Rev. M. J. Foley. But it is with particular pride that he prints the following communication from Cardinal Gasparri:

I received a copy of the *Western Catholic* containing an article on the policy of the Holy Father, which I have referred to his Holiness, who charges me to thank you in his august name and to convey to you the Apostolic Blessing.

In no nation under the sun have Catholics stood more loyally by the Holy Father than in the United States, and no body of men has been more devoted to the Flag than our own American Catholics. We can understand therefore both the editor's indignation at the charge of pro-Germanism brought against the Pope and of his elation at the Papal recognition of his efforts: "This," he exclaims, "is the proudest and happiest day in the life of the *Western Catholic*."

#### The Argument of Tears

**S**OME of the advertising authorized by Dr. Claxton is not calculated to reflect a world of credit upon the Bureau of Education. Thus the *Pittsburgh Gazette-Times* for December 17, quotes rather extensively from the Commissioner's recent "pitiful appeal for 50,000 teachers for 50,000 vacancies." The vacancies, it is explained, are not in the large cities, but "in the one-room schools, floorless cabins, and shacks of varying degrees of indecency." It is further related that in these localities, the teacher is obliged to rise early on winter mornings, trudge across the country, and "build the fire in a rickety stove, to get the schoolroom warm for the children." All this is very moving, but Dr. Claxton's final paragraph contains the real reason of all these tears: "Will 50,000 self-sacrificing women offer themselves for such service, when the United States Government will not sacrifice one nickel to make their life bearable?" A great many people will at once answer this question in the affirmative. "Self-sacrificing" persons, as Dr. Claxton describes them, do not condition their "self-sacrificing service" upon the amount of aid which is going to be issued them from the Federal Treasury at Washington. If they did, there would be little "sacrifice" in the service, but rather a fairly profitable contract. But what, as the *Gazette-Times* properly asks, has the Federal Government to do with the unhappy conditions described by Dr. Claxton? It would be exceedingly easy to draw a most pathetic picture of distress among the poor in a New York winter but somewhat illogical to insist that, because the city cannot possibly reach every such case, "self-sacrificing workers" may properly withdraw from the field, unless the Federal Government will subsidize them. Education, like public relief, belongs to the community, not to the Federal Government. "Some States may be derelict" comments the *Gazette-Times*, "but their rights in this matter are

not to be questioned. Anyway, dumping the schools on the Federal Government would not effect a cure."

#### Austrian and German Views of the Pope

**F**EW who have heard the accusations leveled against the Holy Father by the Allies realize with what bitterness he was accused of Pro-Ally sympathies by the press and people of the Central Powers. This point is well illustrated in an article contributed by Miss Christitch to the *London Tablet* (November 28, 1918). The writer had been held captive for a considerable time in enemy territory, and she thus recounts her experiences:

Deprived as we were of any news from Entente countries, and dependent for our daily reading on the biased and unreliable German press, we grew familiar with incessant attacks on the Holy Father. Looking back, we remember that one of the fiercest diatribes against him was occasioned by a donation from the Vatican early in 1916 for the suffering population of Belgrade, and when we mentioned this to the clergy we got the reply: "It is wrong, of course, but the Pope's attitude of favoritism towards your side is such that our people get incensed!" Likewise a gift of rosaries and prayer-books to the Italian prisoners in Austria was pointed to as "undue partiality," whilst a similar gift to Austrian prisoners in Italy was allowed to pass unnoticed. But the great crime of Benedict XV in the eyes of the Austro-Germans was his open attitude of friendliness towards Cardinal Mercier. "There can be no more pretense of neutrality," said the Germanic press, "since he has identified himself with the pronounced enemy of the German Empire!" Blasphemous fury greeted the Papal Note of 1917: "There speaks the Italian, ready to sacrifice the sacred interests of the Church for the triumph of his race!" became the refrain of the Viennese press.

We in Belgrade had been kept in the dark as to the progress of the war, and we should not have known of the capture of Jerusalem but for the violent criticism of the Catholic organ *Reichspost* of the Pope's rejoicing at the fact. "Here," it was said, "we have for the first time a successor of St. Peter acclaiming the advance of heretics!" Thus was interpreted the Holy Father's whole-hearted appreciation of the sacred city's restitution to Christian hands. In fact, although we never quite believed that the Papal utterances were in accord with the dictates of the British Government, we did go so far as to think that he had abandoned his neutrality to a certain extent in our favor. Great was our astonishment, therefore, on arriving in Switzerland to learn not only that the Entente peoples were dissatisfied with what the Pope had done for them, but that he was actually styled pro-German! And yet at the Austrian frontier, when our documents had been scrupulously examined and we had admitted that it was thanks to Vatican intervention that we had come away, we were told: "Ah, yes; he is *your* Pope, of course; there is no one to look after *our* poor people!"

Nothing can better establish the ideal neutrality preserved by the Holy Father than such facts compared with the equally unreasonable accusations made on the opposing side. For this reason, too, that wonderful peace-prayer of the Pope, "the most perfect prayer for peace that has ever been formulated," as the writer observes, was not popular in any land, owing to the restraints it imposed upon human passion. Yet it was not a pacifist or a defeatist prayer in any sense. The Austrian parish priest, whose church Miss Christitch attended, substituted for it an imperialistic prayer for victory. When the captives objected to this they were told that the Pope, "being personally inclined towards the Latin races, was not able to realize on which side was right." Yet in spite of the preposterous demands made upon him and the calumnies spread against him, the Pope never for a moment surrendered a single principle or showed the least sign of weakness or vacillation. Firm and dignified in the midst of clashing interests, he stood out as the supreme Christ-like figure of the war, from whom the world cannot withhold its admiration.